BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW YORK, JANUARY 1, 1856. NO. 1.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 141 Fulton-street.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

The Resurrection from the Dead Opposed to the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul.

(Continued from volume x, page 356.)

ESSAY VI.—INTERMEDIATE STATE.

"As to the consequences of the present question, it appears, that, on the one side, (that of materialism) there is nothing more than a temporary cessation of thought, which can hurt nobody, except the self-interested Papist, or the self-sufficient Deist, whose high claim to an inherent principle of immortality, is shown to be vain and groundless; but on the other side, (that of immaterialism) there is a manifest derogation *from*, if not a total subversion *of*, that positive covenant, which professes to entitle us to everlasting life; all proper and consistent notions of death, resurrection and a future judgment are confounded; in fine, all the great sanctions of the gospel are rendered unintelligible or useless."—*Bishop Law's Theory of Religion, Postscript*, 437, 438, *&c.*

AN INTERMEDIATE STATE *of conscious and active existence*, which is said to be entered upon immediately at our death, and to continue until the resurrection, will form the subject to be examined in the present paper; and, before we enter upon the arguments by which this doctrine is advocated, we would premise, that the scriptures are most clear and distinct in what they communicate relative to man's future condition, uniformly setting forth that that state is to *commence* at the resurrection—that we shall not live again until the resurrection—that mankind will not be judged before the resurrection—that the faith, labors, and suffering of believers are unprofitable and perish if there be no resurrection. [See Law's Theory, Appendix.] Such being, unequivocally, the doctrines of the scriptures; the supporters of immaterialism, have naturally felt them to be incompatible with their hypothesis; for if an immortal soul be an essential part of man, such soul being, in its own nature, indestructible, then, of necessity, future existence *does* commence *before* the resurrection, and the faith, labors, and sufferings of believers do not, nor can they perish even if a resurrection never takes place: thus situated in regard to doctrines so opposed as those of immaterialism, and a resurrection from the dead, their supporters have had recourse to heathen sources, and from thence, and not from the scriptures, have deduced an hypothesis, which is thus described—"In the interval between death and the resurrection, there is an intermediate state, in which the departed souls of the good are supposed to have an imperfect reward, and the souls of the wicked an imperfect punishment:" [Rees's Cyclopædia, volume 33.—"Sleep of the soul."] and while we in vain look to the scriptures for a description of this "*interval* between death and the resurrection," we readily discover its origin among the comparatively consistent immaterialists of the heathen nations, whom we have shewn in our former Essays, believed souls to be an emanation of that intellectual fire by which the universe is animated; and that when they are released from the body they returned to God; but that, previously to such return, they have "an interval," by being placed in an "*intermediate state*," for the purpose of being purified from the consequences of their late pollution. So early as the second century, Origen, and other "Fathers," incorporated this system with the Christian doctrine of future existence, and from thence the catholic "Purgatory" was immediately derived: so that this essential branch of the doctrine of immaterialism became one of great influence and profit to the Romish Church, into which it was introduced by Gregory in the sixth century, being honored with an infallible affirmation in the year 1140, and so continued until the Reformation, when most of the reformers being content with a small degree of refinement upon Catholicism merely prohibited prayers for the souls of the deceased. To such general belief in the truth of immaterialism Luther, in the early part of his life, was a singular exception. In his defence, (published in 1520) which was condemned by Leo X, he states, "I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful, such as that he is Emperor of the world, King of heaven, and God upon earth—that the *soul is immortal*, with all those monstrous opinions to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals." [Luther's Defence, Proposition xxvuth.] On the latter point, however, Luther seems to have stood nearly alone: neither does it appear that he evinced much perseverance in its defence, opposed as it was to the decrees of the church of Rome, on the one hand, and to the prejudices of his brother reformers on the other; and, indeed, the latter announced that, "Faith requires that we should think, that the dead are not nothing, but that they truly live before God; the pious happily in Christ, the wicked in an horrible expectation of the revelation of divine judgment." [Harmon. Conf. p. 14, 1 Mea Portis.] But it will be found that anything rather than uniformity

of opinion, as to the condition of souls in this "intermediate state," has prevailed and does prevail among its supporters; and that while the decree above quoted apportions to the wicked—"an horrible expectation of the revelation of divine judgment"—Calvin is content to deal only with the souls of "the faithful;" for "it is nothing to me," he observes, "what becomes of *their souls*," (the wicked) "I will only be responsible for the faithful," in an intermediate state; [Psychopon. fol. 50. Edit. 1545,] the more modern defenders of the doctrine abound also with contentions with each other; first, as to the place and condition of the souls, whether virtuous or vicious; secondly, as to the union of the same soul with the same body at the resurrection; and thirdly, as to those passages of scripture which expressly reserve all hopes of future life, of punishment, and of reward, until the resurrection—out of these difficulties and contentions, have arisen a sect of semi-immaterialists, who, while they succeed in proving that neither reward nor punishment can take place *until* the resurrection, yet they most inconsistently contend that a man is animated by a soul; and, for the purpose of reconciling all parties and every inconsistency, they assert that this quality of man, immortal and self-existent as it is, becomes, at the dissolution of the body, partially non-existent, being until the resurrection in a state of sleep, or insensibility. To this absurd position Bishop Warburton, who, it will be seen, was at least *consistent* in his immaterialism, makes a reply possessed of much force. "Their sleep of the soul is mere cant; and this brings me to consider the sense and consistency of so ridiculous a notion. Now sleep is a modification of existence, not of non-existence, so that a sleep of *a substance* hath a meaning—the sleep of *a quality* is nonsense." [Bishop Warburton's Strictures on the Doctrine of the sleep of the soul.] We have thought it well thus to refer to the contradictory theories of our opponents, and that for two reasons; first, because in fairness they might claim to be represented in their own words; and secondly, because it is the best mode of aiding our object; as we feel confident of successfully effecting in the present what we have already done in the previous department of our inquiry; namely, proving not merely a want of scriptural evidence in *support* of immaterialism, but that the doctrines of the scriptures are in unequivocal opposition to it in all its parts. With this strong conviction upon our minds, produced by a careful attention to the arguments on both sides of the question, we shall proceed at once to an examination of such passages in the scriptures as are deemed either directly or inferentially to support the doctrine of an intermediate state; premising, that if the immortality of the soul be true, there is and must be a state of conscious existence, and that enjoyed too by all indiscriminately, prior to the "*judgment of the great day*"—and also, that if there be such a state, it is of the first importance that the fact should have been distinctly communicated; for, if the doctrine be scriptural, we are entitled to ask for the law and the testimony, and in fairness to require that the passages shall be as clear and as decided, because equally required to be so (and from being an essential part of the doctrine of futurity, they would and must be so,) as the declarations of Jesus and his apostles relative to a resurrection from the dead and future judgment: as a proof of the entire want of such evidence, we have upon record a candid, but certainly a very extraordinary confession of one of the ablest defenders of this doctrine, in which, so conscious is the writer of the want of scripture authority, that he is compelled to admit, that "the intermediate state between death and the resurrection is a subject upon which the scriptures *have not said so much as one could wish*." [Dr. Jortin's Sermons.] From such an admission, then, and from such an authority too in this controversy, it will be allowed, that, in fairness of argument, the discussion might, as it regards the scriptural evidence nearly terminate; but that there are other defenders of the same doctrine, who while their arguments prove that they are not in a better condition than the reverend author above quoted, yet seem to have either more faith or less ingenuousness than he possessed; and who contend, that there are "many expressions of scripture, in the natural and obvious sense, which imply that an intermediate and separate state is actually to succeed death." [Dr. Campbell's Preliminary Dissertations, part 2.] With such materials before us, therefore, we propose examining not merely the "expressions" which are assumed to "imply" such a state, but also the strong cases which it is contended, directly and unequivocally reveal such a state. To the latter class of arguments we shall first direct our attention, and it will be found to embrace several difficult portions of the scriptures, and among the number, the one which is the most confidently relied upon by our opponents shall take the precedence. On account of its assumed importance to their theory, as well as to give effect to the subjoined refutation, we shall quote the whole of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, as recorded by Luke, who thus represents Jesus as addressing his disciples as well as the Scribes and Pharisees:—"There was a certain rich man which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table; the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died and was buried. And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom: and he said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented: and besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulph fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." (Luke xvi.) Here we have to remark that this parable can admit of but one of two modes of interpretation—either figurative or literal:

if the former, then the connexion in which it occurs; the circumstances which gave rise to it; the definite object for which it was delivered; and the admitted character of allegorical instruction, are all essential to its being correctly understood: if the latter, then every circumstance enumerated must be taken *literally* as they are related; and, indeed, so necessary do some of the defenders of an intermediate state esteem a literal interpretation, that, in an answer to Priestley, published in 1778, we are apprised that "we should never presume to stray from the express, "obvious, literal meaning." Bound then by such conditions, we look at this parable, and bear in our minds, that the soul of man is described by its advocates to be spiritual—not visible to the sight, and that it takes its flight, immediately upon the dissolution of the body, to inhabit a state which is thus described by an author before referred to: that "whilst the good enter into a state of peace and comfort, the wicked are properly condemned to an *insensible condition* till the last day calls them forth." [Dr. Jortin's Sermons.] *Literally*, then, it appears that Lazarus, not an immortal soul, but that the "*beggar*" Lazarus, "*full of sores*," was immediately upon his death, carried by angels and deposited in the bosom of Abraham—that the rich man at his death was placed not in an "intermediate state;" not in Dr. Jortin's "insensible condition till the last day;" but was in hell "*tormented in flame*"—that the receptacle for the virtuous is so immediately in the neighborhood of that for the wicked, that the parties can *see* each other, that they can hold familiar conversation together—that Abraham, though on the other "*side of the gulph*," and in heaven, is still the "Father" of the wicked in hell; and that the aforesaid wicked are acknowledged by Abraham to be his *Sons;* and that, finally, if it be contended, that it was the immortal soul of Lazarus that was in Abraham's bosom, and the immortal soul of the rich man that required a drop of water to cool its immortal tongue, then *immaterial* spirits can be burned by *material* fire; and though not visible to the sight, nor tangible to the touch, could go to the rich man's "*father's house*," to his five brethren, and could "*testify unto them*," lest they also came to the like place of torment. This, we submit, to take it *literally*, is the fair interpretation of this parable, teaching, as it is said to do, the "*immediate* transition of the soul into one or other of these two different states, which is observable in the narration or parable itself, from their death to their succeeding state of happiness or misery." [Bulkley's Discourses on the Parables of the New Testament.] And we might, perhaps, leave to our adversaries the solution of their own difficulties, and the reconciling of such direct contradictions in their system, as flow from applying this parable to the support of the doctrine of an intermediate state of existence. One, indeed, among their number, has felt it judicious not to hazard too large a portion of his faith upon the present parable, and admits, that it is "*not a representation of an intermediate state*, but of the final state of the righteous and the wicked." [Bishop Warburton,] This admission of the reverend immaterialist is, we contend, completely and to the fullest extent, giving up the point in debate: but still, we shall proceed to shew, that it is not even a representation of "the final state of the righteous and the wicked," much less that for which Macknight put in his claim, "that it teaches us that the souls of men are immortal; that they subsist in a separate state after the dissolution of the body; and that they" (in such state, we presume) "are rewarded or punished, according to their actions in this life." [Macknight, vol. ii, p. 294.] With this object we look to the preceding chapter, and from thence learn, that the "*pharisees and scribes murmured*" at the teaching of Jesus; and that he "*spake parables unto them.*" This teaching by parables being "that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of a fictitious event, applied by way of a simile to the illustration of some important truth." [Bishop Lowth's Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews.] The objects of Jesus in the severul parables in the present connexion would appear to be, to shew that his attention to "*publicans and sinners*" was agreeable to the will of God; to expose the self-righteous Jews, who "*justified themselves before men;*" to correct avaricious dispositions—"*for the pharisees, who were covetous, heard all these things and they derided him;*" and wisely and by gradual steps to exhibit to his disciples and others, the true character of God, and develope a knowledge of the divine dispensations in fulfilling the covenant with Abraham, by the calling in of the Gentiles. To these objects, the present parable, and that of the Prodigal Son, with which it is connected, are especially directed:—in the latter, the eldest son; in the former, the "*certain rich man, clothed in purple and fine linen*," are the representatives of the proud and privileged Jew; exactly those characters, some of whom were then near Jesus, and who, though "highly esteemed among men, were an abomination in the sight of God;"—in the one case, the outcast son; in the other, the despised beggar, are the representatives of the gentiles, hitherto excluded from the kingdom of God. But "the law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." (Verse 16.) The kingdom being, since the time of John, thrown open to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, such as entered into it were carried by angels*—by messengers—such messengers being Jesus and his apostles—into Abraham's bosom—into the kingdom of God; that kingdom or church which originated with Abraham, and the enlargement of which at the time of Jesus being misunderstood by the Jews, they in their turn became the outcasts. They *had* received their "*good things*," and the

* "The word *angel*, is not properly a denomination of nature, but of office; denoting as much as *nuncius, messenger*, a person employed to carry one's orders, or to declare his will."—*Rees's Cyclopædia, Angel.* "The Greek word we render angel, does, in its primitive sense, signify nothing more than messengers; and, accordingly, in James ii. 25, it is the same Greek word that is rendered angels in other passages that is there rendered *messengers*."—See *Goadby*, vol. iv. p. 210.

Gentiles their "*evil ones;*" but now they were comforted, and the Jews were tormented; because they would not hear Moses and the prophets: neither were they persuaded when one *did* rise from the dead. This interpretation, we submit, is not a strained one, but a fair and rational explanation of the parable we have been examining; and one which, while it makes it harmonize with the connexion in which it occurs, and to be suitable to the circumstances under which, and the parties to whom, it was delivered, must shew, on the one hand, the gross absurdity of attempting to make it teach popish and heathen doctrines; and on the other, the pitable condition in which a correct knowledge of the scriptures must ever place the defenders of immaterialism.

(To be continued.)

THE JUDGMENT.

BY THE EDITOR.

Much has been said and written on this subject; but we fear a large portion has been "words without knowledge," and that no really definite and practical ideas have been the result. The general notion of the judgment is that of a great assize or court, at which the entire race of Adam are to be *assembled* in one vast concourse, and that each individual case is *then* and *there* to be examined, and all the thoughts of his heart, actions of his life, words of his lips, as well as the *motives* which have governed him, are to pass in review, and his case be decided upon the evidence then appearing, after which the sentence is to be pronounced, and ths execution to follow.

Against this view there are great and (with present light) insuperable objections. In presenting them, however, we are aware, we shall have to encounter an almost impassable barrier in the minds of many sincere souls who have had the common notion interwoven in all their religious thoughts and instructions.

Far be it from us to approach such time-honored sentiments with rude hands, and far from us be the wish to unsettle any mind in such a cherished idea, unless we can offer them a more scriptural one, and one that shall be more practical in its influence upon their hearts and lives. Believing, however, that it is possible the popular view may be erroneous, if not pernicious, in its influence, we shall proceed to state some objections to it, and then see if the Scriptures do not warrant and require a different view of the subject.

To the correctness of the view generally entertained, we suggest, first, an objection as to *the time* necessary to such a procedure. We are not to rush upon a conclusion blindly: and it is doubtless true that not one in a thousand, ministers or people, ever have exercised their thoughts on *the time* that must be occupied to *conclude* the judgment, if the popular theory be the true one.

The position we are to occupy on this subject, is not that of a *dogmatist*—or positiveness—but of *investigation*, to find, if possible, the truth on a subject of such absorbing interest to every serious and reflecting mind.

THE TIME *necessary to an examination of each individual case, in the formal manner expressed or implied in the common theory, is an insuperable objection to it.*

As to the number of the human family, it is impossible to arrive at any thing like certainty; yet we are not of those who suppose the number has been so great that they could not all stand upon the globe at one time, as some have affirmed. For a basis of calculation, we will suppose that one generation of the world lasts thirty years. This would give 200 generations in 6000 years. We will now take the present number of the inhabitants of the globe (eight or nine hundred millions) as the number to represent each generation; though it will be seen that this most likely gives us too many. Eight hundred millions multiplied by 200, (the number of generations from Adam to the end of 6000 years), will give us *one hundred and sixty thousand millions* (160,000,000,000!) as the sum total of the human family to be judged, provided the judgment is to occur at the close of the 6000 years. Now, let us allot some specific time to the examination and decision of each individual case, on the supposition they are to be judged in succession—that is, one after another.

1. Allow *one second* to each individual, and *six thousand years* must be taken up in the process.

2. Allow *one minute* to each case, and *three hundred and sixty thousand years* are necessary.

3. Give *one hour* to each, and *twenty-one millions six hundred thousand years* are required. (21,600,000 years!)

4. Let *one day* be the time for each case, and near *eight thousand millions of years* will be necessary to complete the judgment. (8,000,000,000 of years!)

We do not affirm such a period will not be occupied in the judgment, but it certainly looks doubtful when the Scriptures seem every where to speak of the speedy *execution* of the sentence of the judgment on the *return* of Christ. There seems only one way to avoid this protraction of the judgment, and that is to suppose that the examination of all, or of large numbers, is proceeding at one and the same time. This indeed is possible, but then it breaks in upon the notion that each individual case is to be examined before all and exposed to all the race of men.

If we reduce the number to be examined and judged to one-half of our estimate, as likely we may in truth, and then allow only *one hour* to each case, at least *ten millions of years* would be necessary to complete the judgment, and before sentence could be executed; or a period about *sixteen hundred times* as long as it has been since Adam was created.

Notwithstanding this seemingly insurmountable difficulty to the common theory, if the Scripture positively affirmed such to be the process of judgment, we would bow to its testimony; but we may find it does not, and we are therefore at liberty to search to see if some other view of the judgment is not the true one.

In addition to the foregoing objection, we urge another on the attention of those who believe the righteous will have a *priority, in time,* in the re-

surrection, whether that time be one hour, one day, one year, or a thousand years.

How is it to be known who are to have *part* in this favored class, if all in their graves have not been judged *before* the resurrection *begins?* Are the righteous to be raised and then the process of judgment to be instituted, to see whether the Searcher of hearts has made a mistake? Or, are they to be tried, undergo an examination after their resurrection, as if *suspected* characters? Can we adopt either of these positions? If not, must it not be manifest that they had been judged *before* being raised? And why are they raised, and not the wicked at the same instant, except the wicked also have been judged, and found not worthy to have part in this prior, or "first resurrection?" If these things are so, then we are brought to the inevitable conclusion that the judgment, in which *character and doom* is decided, is at some period *prior* to the resurrection. This, let it be remembered, is not saying there is not a judgment—yea, "*a great day of judgment,*" at, or immediately upon, the resurrection; but the *nature* of that judgment will be a subject of inquiry as we proceed.

Before going farther, we will endeavor to find out the meaning of the terms judged and judgment. They are variously applied in the Scriptures.

Judgment, in its most simple form, signifies the act of judging, or, the process of examining facts and arguments, to ascertain truth, propriety and justice. It also signifies the determination of the mind, or the conclusion the mind has arrived at from an examination of things presented to its consideration, It is sometimes put for the spirit of wisdom with which a person is endowed. Sometimes it signifies the statutes, or laws and testimony of God. This is often the case, as in Psa. 119. It is applied to remarkable calamities inflicted upon communities and nations. Also, to judicial decisions, and to the *execution* of the sentence following trial and conviction, or acquittal.

These are the general ideas contained in the terms judge and judgment. There are judicial judgments on individuals, communities and nations. The Lord told Abraham He would "*judge* that nation," who were to "afflict" his seed "four hundred years." The process of judgment is definitely recorded in Exodus. Not a personal appearance of Jehovah to the persons judged; but he tested them,—that is, the *rulers* of Egypt, by his servant Moses, and gave them sufficient evidence to have led them to regard his demand, to "let Israel go," if they had not persisted, through their covetousness, to hold those whom they had enslaved. The demands of Moses, and the evidence he exhibited, in the name of the God of the Hebrews, was the judgment process that was to decide the doom of Egypt, or her Princes. Then follows the *executive* judgment, or the judgment carried into execution; and the Lord said, as the *deciding* judgment was drawing to a close, "I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt.....and against all the gods [princes] of Egypt I will *execute* judgment." The *executive* judgment *commenced* that night, and terminated, or was *completed,* at the Red Sea, when Pharoah and all his princes were destroyed. This was judging a nation, or rather her *body of rulers.* The principle, we apprehend, is here brought out, that the judgment is constituted or made up of two parts, viz: the *investigating* judgment, and the *executive* judgment. The one precedes the other. The first goes on while in a *state of trial,* and when the trial closes, and the evidence or testimony is all elicited, the sentence is passed: the executive judgment follows after at some fixed period. We might illustrate this view with several other examples from Scripture, but we judge this is sufficient for the present.

We now come to the question, *Is the Judgment at the end of the world*—end of the *age*—or *at the resurrection*—the INVESTIGATING *judgment,* or *the* EXECUTIVE *one?*

This question is an important and interesting one; involving much more than may at first appear; we must therefore examine it with care, and see that we do not come to hasty conclusions. If it should prove to be the investigating judgment, we are thrown back on the difficulties before suggested. On the other hand, if it be found to be the executive judgment, we shall inquire at what period or time does the judgment of investigation take place? which will open a field for many solemn and heart-searching thoughts.

1. IS THE JUDGMENT AT THE RESURRECTION THE EXECUTIVE ONE?

With present light, we are inclined to the opinion that it is, and that the investigating judgment terminates before the executive one commences, so far as relates to all men who are the subjects of this executive judgment.

1. *Christ is specially the executive Judge.* In this respect "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, * * * and hath given him authority to *execute* judgment." John v.

2. *The judgment at the resurrection is by Christ.* The examination of a few texts will show us that it is clearly an *executive* one; or if an investigating one at all, it is but faintly expressed, and is *inferred* rather than clearly affirmed.

1. "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his holy angels: and *then* he shall *reward* every man according to his works." Matt. 16: 27.

No other idea of judgment is *expressed* here than that of an executive one. We do not affirm, no other is implied: but the simple expression is that of execution.

2. That which seems more to express an investigating judgment is Matthew 25: 31. But if that portion of Scripture is carefully examined, we shall, perhaps, see little cause to conclude it is an account of anything more than an executive judgment. Christ, on the throne of his glory, proceeds at once to "*separate* one from another," the whole account of which is embraced in two verses, 32, 33; and then he proceeds directly to the *executive* judgment, commencing with the righteous, v. 34. The whole is, apparently, a proclamation of the result of a previous investigation, the sentence, or judgment of which is now to be *executed;* the whole transaction seemingly occupying no very protracted period.

3. "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may *receive* the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5 : 10.

Here is a clear statement of what men are to stand before Christ for. It is to *receive* the reward of their deeds : in other words, that the "judgment written" may be *executed* upon them. There is certainly no clear announcement that an *investigating* judgment *then* takes place.

4. Rev. 20 : 11, 15, next demands our attention, as clearly affirming an *investigating* judgment at the last day, if any text in the Bible does. If that does not, it will be difficult to find one that does. At first view, and coming to it with the prejudices of our entire religious education, this text seems to teach that there is an *investigation* at that time, as well as an *execution*. But a close examination may serve to lessen our confidence in the idea of an investigating judgment on the occasion. Mark : "The dead, small and great"—the lowly and the illustrious—"stand before God ; and the books were opened." The language "books" is of course figurative. But what books are they? Not *blank* ones, now to be filled up, for they are already "*written*," or filled up ; which was the case at the time they were *opened ;* so that the writing must have been done prior to that time. The natural conclusion is, they are books of *record*, and had been filled up with *testimony* given at some previous period. Where there is a court of investigation, in order to a decision, the testimony is written down or recorded. At the *opening* of such court or seat of justice, no books of recorded testimony, relating to the individual to be tried, are *opened*. The books of law may then be opened, but it is manifest in Rev. 20 : 12, that if the book of law was included, the books of testimony are especially noted : for "the dead were judged out of"—*ek*—or, on account of—"those things written in the books ;" which judgment is expressly said to be "*according* to their works," or according to that testimony "written in the books ;" and the language repeated in verse 13, "they were judged every man according to their works," carries the idea, in connection with the context, that this judgment was an executive judgment: that is, it was the time in which, and transaction by which, the "judgment *written*" was *executed;* for, "whosoever was *not found written* in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire." So then some names were written in the book of life when "the books" were opened ; others were not found there ; which seems conclusive evidence that the judgment of investigation—or receiving testimony for and against, and deciding what should be the reward of every man—was a previous transaction : and the assembling now before God is in order to the *execution*, or to inflict the punishment and bestow the reward as found written in the books.

It cannot be denied, we think, but that those whose names were found written in the book of life, at the very time the books were opened, must have been judged at some period previously, and their case determined, else their names had not been found there on opening the books ; and if they had previously been judged and acquitted, so it is reasonable to suppose the others had been judged and condemned. Thus it would seem the judgment (Rev. 20 : 12) is not the investigating judgment, but the executive one, or the one of *execution*. The several texts now examined may be enlarged upon at another time, and others of like character considered.

If the judgment, at the resurrection, or at the last day, is executive, and not the judgment of investigation, *when* and *where* is the INVESTIGATING judgment ?—and on what *principles* is it conducted ?

This is a solemn inquiry ; and may the Father of light shed His divine rays of truth on our minds, that we may be so led into an understanding of His word that we may be sanctified through the truth, and be able to spread truth in the path of our fellow-men, that they may see how holy it becomes us all to live, whose every word, every work, and "every secret thing" is to come into judgment, or be *investigated* before God, or pass in His view for His decision or judgment upon it.

In answer to the first part of the question before us, one word—though not exactly scriptural in its *form*, yet expressing truth, and universally employed in theology—expresses the fact we wish to develop : that word is "*Probation*." The very idea of the word is *trial—examination—any proceeding designed to ascertain truth*. Webster says : "in *general*, trial for proof, or satisfactory evidence, or the time of trial."

In this definition the idea is fully brought out, on which we wish to fix attention, viz : As all theologians maintain this present life, or a man's lifetime, is his time of probation, then he is *now on trial*, or the *investigating* judgment is in actual session at this moment, and every individual during his life, is on trial before God the righteous "Judge of all the earth ;" and each one is, day by day, not only at the bar of the investigating judgment, but is himself the *witness* for or against himself, and is every hour giving *testimony* on which the judge decides the case. Solemn thought! And here let it be remembered, that "God will bring every work into judgment, with every *secret thing*, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." How solemn the consideration, that each one of us, is, every hour, testifying before Jehovah's court for or against ourselves ! Every word we utter is a part of our testimony ; every act of our lives is but our own testimony in our case ; every temper of mind indulged or cultivated, goes to make up the chain of testimony ; and all our *motives* in life are so many links in the chain. What a life are we then living ! Always in court—always on trial—always giving evidence by which the Judge is to decide our doom ! Here is a practical influence flowing out from this view of the subject. Men cannot say "judgment will never begin," as most in fact do on the popular theory. No, they are now in the "judgment of this world"—they are now arraigned at Jehovah's bar, and this judgment has proceeded so far, and so much testimony has already been elicited, that every impenitent unbeliever "*is condemned already*"—is this moment under *sentence of death*, and the day of *executive* judgment is hastening on, though the judge offers to all men a free pardon through Jesus Christ, if they will accept it before the day, the

great day, of executive judgment arrives. He is long-suffering in the *execution* of the sentence. If men abuse and slight the forbearance of the Lord, the justice of their execution will be more apparent and their guilt terribly increased.

The matter stands thus. Men are now passing through the investigating judgment: and for their sins, on their own testimony—out of their own mouths, and by their lives they are now condemned to death, and the day of executive judgment approacheth. During the interval, God promises to blot out the sins of those who, with a broken heart for sin, and true faith in, or reliance upon his mercy in Christ, seek to him *for pardon;* and he has promised to such *life—eternal life.* Those who embrace this gracious offer are actually *pardoned*—the sentence of the investigating judgment is revoked—their sins are remembered no more: and enduring in allegiance to God to the end of their trial the testimony is in favor of their *acquittal;* and when the Executive Judge, viz. Jesus Christ, comes to "*execute* judgment upon all," those "in Christ" are first acquitted by him. This is the *first* act of executive judgment: "the dead in Christ rise," not to be *examined* to see if they may live, or to have their sins which have been blotted out exposed to the gaze of men and angels! No. They rise to life—*eternal life—to immortality,* Such is "the judgment of the great day" with respect to them.

On the other hand, Christ executes the judgment of death—perdition—"*everlasting destruction*" on them that know not God *and* obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ"—which was the Gospel of *life eternal* in the kingdom of God.

"Because *sentence* against an evil work was not *speedily executed,* therefore the hearts of the sons of men were fully set in them to do evil." It seems Solomon understood the "sentence" had passed on evil doers; and yet wicked men took advantage of the delay in its execution to persist in sin. Could evil-doers have been persuaded that the *sentence itself* was still in the uncertain future, they might have persuaded themselves that somehow they would altogether escape that also, as multitudes do now. Let them know they are now passing through the judicial trial, and that their own testimony of themselves is such that the judge has *already* pronounced the *death sentence* upon them, and their only hope is to fly at once to him, while He holds out the sceptre of mercy by Christ, and seek earnestly through God's beloved Son, *pardon,* not delaying till the day of execution; for then no pardons will be granted. But while the day of execution is *unknown,* let the *condemned* seek God's mercy, through the true Advocate, and pardon is certain: and enduring steadfast in obedience thereafter to God, eternal life will be given.

The foregoing article on "*The Judgment*" is one that we first published six or seven years since. We now republish it by special request.

"The Advent Review, *and Sabbath Herald*" has been removed from Rochester, N. Y., to *Battle Creek,* Mich., U. Smith is "Resident Editor."

From Eld. J. B. Cook.

Rochester, Nov. 21st, 1855.

Dear Brother:—I find in my travels an increasing interest in the *Life* question. It is indeed of absorbing interest to all mankind; though this is covered up from the view of the great mass by a false education. I have had quite a tour of five weeks in Canada. Not a believer in the Advent—not one who is willing to rise above sectarianism and hear the word of the Lord on all subjects—do I find who was against the doctrine of "Life and Immortality" through "Jesus and the resurrection." It is possible there may be exceptions; but I do not recollect them. I am much interested in the ovewhelming evidence that the seventh,—"the last," or Resurrection trump is about to be sounded.

Surely the "Gogue" power, Ez. 38, does not come into the series of the four kingdoms, Dan. 7: 8. As I have gone to the depths of that investigation, (so far as able,) it is certain that those who have adopted the theory of "Anatolia," are dreadfully *misled.* But as I am from present appearances to be allowed to speak and be *heard,* soon, I will not anticipate your reader's decision. All I claim is a fair investigation. Let each one use his *own* best manner, till he is impeached. Plainess of speech and distinctiveness of statement is not a sin, but a *virtue* in any writer who keeps in the channel of *truth*—God's word and *fact.*

"Chapman's Principia; *or, Nature's First Principles,*" which we noticed in the Examiner Nov. 15th, has been received. We have had time yet only to glance over it; but have no doubt it must be deeply interesting to the scientific, and those who wish to obtain knowledge of the "electrical action pervading the solar system."

"The Cross and Crown" is published at Machias Port, Me., by H, L. Hastings and J. Lenfest. It is a monthly of 16 pages, "sent to all who desire it, *with or without price.*" Those who choose to pay can send 50 cents. We fear our Brethren will find a lack of support on their *accommodating* terms; but we wish them success in trying to do good; and presume they will do their best to that end.

"The Anti-Pantheist."—Such is the title of a work to be published in numbers, by Stephen Deuel, Dayton, Ohio. Twelve numbers of 50 pages each at $1. It is designed to "Expose the errors of false metaphysics, give a full history, reveal the character and falsity of modern *Pantheistic Spiritualism,* and prove the incapacity of the *Harmonial Philosophy* to meet the wants of the human soul," &c. We may notice it more fully after awhile.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 1, 1856.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—The price of this paper has been increased to $2 for 24 numbers. Until the past two years it was issued *monthly* at $1, per year. Some said if we would issue *semi*-monthly, at the same price, it would much increase our subscribers; but two years' experience has taught us those persons were mistaken. Our list has not materially changed; and the amount on subscription has no more than paid the *printer*, allowing us nothing for all our labor and toil; and but for *donations*, for our personal benefit, we know not in what way we should have supported our family. Thanks to those kind *Donors*. A few friends in Philadelphia made us up more than a hundred dollars to close the past year; which, in connection with donations from individuals elsewhere, has enabled us to finish the past year without serious personal embarrassment; yet as to funds for publishing *books*, we have, absolutely, *none;* and we have exhausted every copy of "*Bible vs. Tradition*," we had on hand, in giving *premiums* to those who have paid $2 for 1856, before this date; and also the largest part of our "*Revised Six Sermons*." More must be printed soon.

Nothing short of either putting the price of the EXAMINER up to $2 for 24 numbers or returning to a *monthly* issue could have kept the paper *alive*. As it is, the EXAMINER will go on with its regular *semi*-monthly issue. We thank our friends, who, so many of them, have promptly responded, and remitted the $2.

We have some *ninety* sets of the EXAMINER, in *sheets*, from Feb. 15 to Dec. 15, of last year (21 numbers;) of which we will give one set to any subscriber who shall hereafter send us $2 for *this year*, till the 90 sets are exhausted; or, we will give them a copy of the "*Discussion*" with Prof. Mattison, *bound*, or two copies in paper covers. In either case we will send them free of postage. We will continue, during *this month*, if desired, to send a copy of the "*Revised* Six Sermons" as a premium to those who send us $2 for the 24 numbers of the EXAMINER for 1856; but the subscriber must pay the postage on it, *viz:* ten cents, if pre-paid. If the Sermons are taken the other works named will not be given, as above stated.

DONATIONS.—We shall acknowledge donations for our personal benefit by letter or personally, hereafter, and *not* in the EXAMINER. Some of our friends are not willing to have their names appear; and all, we presume, will like it quite as well to have our *private* acknowledgment. If any have not received our acknowledgment, privately, it is because our letter has miscarried, or it has been overlooked by some means. They may be sure it has not been from a lack of a sense of obligation to them for their kindness. May the Lord abundantly bless you all, "according to the riches of His grace in glory, by Jesus Christ" our Lord and *Life-Giver*.

"AN OLD HEATHEN."—So the Rev. ABEL STEVENS calls Plato, in one of his letters from Europe, which are being published in the *Christian Advocate* of this city. And what has this "old heathen" done? According to Mr. Stevens, he has done what *Christianity* could not do. No wonder Mr. S. calls this a "*strange fact!*" Mr. Stevens seems to glory that "*Plato always had a similar influence in the church!*"

The truth is, the so called "*Church*" has attempted to establish the dogma of an "immortal soul" in man, which is unsustained by a single text in the volume of inspiration. But this immortal soul theory has compelled its advocates to adopt the mystical system of explanation, which has led thinking minds to the conclusion that there is nothing *rational* in the Book professing to be a revelation. The consequence has been a grievous departure of many men, of investigating minds, into what is called "*Rationalism*." From that position, Christianity, as it is *doctrinally* maintained by the immortal soul advocates, cannot reclaim them; so Christ and his teaching must be abandoned for "PLATO!" Not till this "old heathen" has done his delusive work can immortal soul christianity be made to bear on a man of mind and fit him for the mystical system of "*spiritualism*," which from the Bible *alone* can never be taught, because not there. There is indeed a *Bible* "spiritualism;" but it is just as different from the *Platonistic christianity* as a *resurrection* from the dead is different from an immortal soul. But we give our readers Mr. Stevens' remarks and leave them to make their own conclusions. He says:—

"I showed in my last that a great change came over the theological mind of Germany under the influence of Schleiermacher. He was led back from German scepticism by the help of an old heathen—this is one of the strange facts above alluded to. Plato made Schleiermacher ashamed of the crude, materialistic, heartless unbelief of Rationalistic theologians around him. Plato has

always had a sim
Some of the 'Fathe
tian truths had been
A Platonist in ph
was in a mood to re
Christianity itself.
to preach Christ.
A corps of excelle
men rose up around
from his lecture-ro
der, who at his C
old Jewish name, (f
the Greek one of Ne
also, the champion
tianity, went forth
influence of what i
was an exception, h
usefulness."

J. P. M. PECK ir
AMINER, from Oswe
which, to us, is of
excuse us for giving

"One of our mc
the Bible, and belie
AMINER advocates, I
It was Judge HAR
and formerly a *Jud*
others, many of yo
dead and destructio
them among his fi
30th of Nov.; in
your EXAMINER. S
pleasure was manife
the evil tendency of
had no fears in th
Angel of *death* s
apoplexy. It woul
conversed with him,
of him, and possess
mind, and a good
candor. We, and y

NOTE BY EDITOR.
man's death is no e
usually. Some wh
the churches have
down dead, without
ters have done this
idea that it is a spec
better foundation t
and the person who
narrow minded bigo
standing of the mor
friends were just such
them, and sent them
man to *pray* for ther
bigots their folly.

always had a similar influence in the Church. Some of the 'Fathers' believed that many christian truths had been revealed to him by inspiration. A Platonist in philosophy, Schleiermacher soon was in a mood to receive the purer spiritualism of Christianity itself. He published Plato, and began to preach Christ. His students felt his influence. A corps of excellent scholars and really spiritual men rose up around him; yet while he sent forth from his lecture-room the great and good Neander, who at his Christian baptism renounced his old Jewish name, (for he was a Jew,) and assumed the Greek one of Neander, (the 'new man,') Strauss also, the champion of the Mythic theory of Christianity, went forth from it—so uncertain is the influence of what is called philosophy. Strauss was an exception, however, to the great Platonist's usefulness."

J. P. M. PECK in forwarding money for the EXAMINER, from Oswego, N. Y., writes as follows; which, to us, is of so much interest that he will excuse us for giving it to our readers.

"One of our most faithful and close readers of the Bible, and believers in the doctrine your EXAMINER advocates, has lately fallen asleep in death. It was Judge HART of this place: an old resident, and formerly a *Judge*. He has purchased, through others, many of your works on the sleep of the dead and destruction of the wicked, and scattered them among his friends. He died suddenly, the 30th of Nov.; in perfect health, while reading your EXAMINER. Some have said, that God's displeasure was manifested in this manner, because of the evil tendency of your paper, &c. The Judge had no fears in that direction. Instead of the *Angel* of *death* smiting him, I suppose it was apoplexy. It would have done you good to have conversed with him, as he was a man, every inch of him, and possessed a good memory, a good mind, and a good reasoning faculty, with much candor. We, and you, have lost a good friend."

NOTE BY EDITOR.—The manner or mode of a man's death is no evidence for or against him, usually. Some who have been most esteemed in the churches have been instantly killed or fallen down dead, without a moment's warning. Ministers have done this when in their pulpits. The idea that it is a special judgment of God has no better foundation than any other *superstition;* and the person who suggests it shows himself a narrow minded bigot, who has little or no understanding of the moral government of God. Job's friends were just such men; and JEHOVAH rebuked them, and sent them back to Job for that afflicted man to *pray* for them. May the Lord show such bigots their folly.

Books Published at this Office.

1. "BIBLE VS. TRADITION, *in which the True Teachings of the Bible is Manifested, the Corruptions of Theologians Detected, and the Traditions of Men Exposed.*"

This work contains 312 pages, neatly bound, and is the most full exhibition of the whole subject relating to man's constitution, nature, and destiny, of anything that has appeared. Those who wish to possess one of the best *helps* to the understanding of Scripture language should have a copy of the work. *Price* 75 cents.

2. SIX SERMONS *on the Inquiry, Is there Immortality in Sin and Suffering?* Also, a Sermon on *Christ The Life-Giver*, or the Faith of the Gospel, by GEO. STORRS, Editor of the *Bible Examiner.*" To which is prefixed a Portrait of the Author, from a steel plate engraving, and likewise "*A Biographical Sketch,*" or brief notice of him. The price, in neat and good binding, is 63 cents; full bound in *gilt*, $1.

3. "THE DISCUSSION of the Question,—'*Does the Bible teach that the Creature Man—which the* LORD *God formed of the dust of the ground —has a superadded entity called the soul?*'—between PROF. H. MATTISON, of the Methodist E. Church, and GEO. STORRS, *Editor of the Bible Examiner,*" with the "CONCLUSION," in a *Pamphlet*, 166 pages, 12mo. Price, in paper covers, 25 cents. On *extra* paper and bound in muslin, 50 cents.

4. "UNITY OF MAN; or, *A Reply to Rev. Luther Lee,*" on the immortality question, "by *Anthropos.*" 120 pages, 18mo. Price 12 cents; $7 by the 100.

5. THE ORIGINAL "SIX SERMONS," 18mo., including the tract on the "*Rich Man and Lazarus,*" the whole making 96 pages. We have issued a small edition of these in pamphlet, and reduced the price to 12 cents: $7 by the 100.

The foregoing works are the only ones we have on hand, published by ourself. None of our other works—which we had previous to the fire in Feb. last—have been republished, and we cannot supply them if called for. We make this explicit statement that none need trouble themselves or us by sending for what *we cannot furnish.* Any of the foregoing works will be sent free of postage to those who send us the *retail* price, when sent within 3000 miles. One-third discount will be made when $3 worth are taken at once: in that case they are sent at the expense of the purchaser. A few works we have "*on sale*" we will give a list of in a short time.

Is there Positive Testimony that the Wicked Dead will be made Alive?
H. Grew's Fifth Rejoinder to Respondent.

Dear Br. Storrs:—A very few remarks shall close what I have to offer on the first question.

1. Respondent's admission "that the wicked dead will have a resurrection 'in some sense,'" certainly nullifies one of his main proofs: Isa. 26: 14, "They shall not rise." Indeed it appears to me to be, *substantially*, a renunciation of his theory. He will, I presume, admit that it will be a "resurrection (to) *condemnation*," to which it appears common sense requires us to attach life or consciousness.

2. I submit, dear brother, that I *proved* from our Lord's testimony respecting the few and many stripes, and other passages, teaching that men are to receive hereafter according to the deeds done in the body, that "divine justice requires a resurrection to temporary life," &c., and that I have not merely "*assumed*" it.

3. Permit me to ask, if the declaration concerning a certain class of men, that they "shall not be *hurt* of the second death," does not imply that the opposite class will be "hurt" or "*suffer*," by it? Rev. 2: 11.

4. Far be it that I should hang upon Rev. 20: 5, if it is "spurious." The 12th verse stands in a connection which appears to prove the same as verse 5 seems to imply.

5. Truly Respondent remarks, the question is what God will "do with *the entire man*" hereafter; but the question at issue is, do not our Lord's words, "Fear him, which *after* he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell," Luke 12: 5, clearly teach that wicked men have something to fear *after* the *first* death? Can they not be "hurt by the second death?" Rev. 2: 11. Does not Matt. 13: 42, teach that when, "after he hath killed," Luke 12: 5, he casts into hell, that "there shall be *wailing*," &c., which certainly implies *life?*

6. I freely admit that the infliction of punishment which justice requires is connected with the moral order of the universe and is for the general good. The question is, can it be proved that "the second death" with its attendant suffering, is not of this character?

QUESTION II. "IS THERE TESTIMONY AS TO THE MEANS OR POWER BY WHICH THEY (they wicked dead,) ARE TO RECEIVE LIFE?"

I answer in the affirmative.

1. We have the testimony of "the faithful Witness," that they "shall hear his voice and come forth—to the resurrection of condemnation." John 5: 28, 29. You see, my brother, my sword is a *two*-edged one. As the Spirit of God is given to his Son without measure, John 3: 34; his voice, in this case, is the same as the Spirit or power of God.

2. If Rom. 8: 11, was the only passage relating to the subject of the resurrection, it might indeed be improper to allow a resurrection "both of the just and the unjust." Respondent's own rule of interpretation requires him to compare and harmonize the passage with others relating to the same subject. The indwelling of the Spirit may be a *special* evidence to the saints of their resurrection, in perfect consistency with the fact that the wicked also will be quickened by the power of God. Respondent admits that the passage does not disprove their resurrection in some sense.

QUESTION III. "IF THE WICKED DEAD ARE MADE ALIVE, BY WHAT MEANS IS THAT LIFE SUSTAINED DURING THE JUDGMENT, OR ANY PERIOD ALLOTTED TO TORMENT AFTER?"

"This is a question that it will take a little 'common sense' to solve," Respondent observes. Precious little common sense, brother, is required to solve all difficulties which may be supposed to attend the subject. Infinite wisdom and power can easily furnish the means.

Truly yours,

HENRY GREW.

Response to H. Grew's Fifth Rejoinder.

"1." We do not perceive how our "admission," that the wicked dead will have a resurrection, *in some sense*, "nullifies one of" our "main proofs," *viz:* "Isa. 26: 14;" for that text not only saith, "They shall not rise," but it explicitly declares, "They *are dead*, they shall NOT LIVE:" and the language is used in *contrast* with the Lord's people, of whom it is said, verse 19, "*Thy* dead men *shall live*," &c.

The "*sense*," in which the wicked dead may have a resurrection, we may illustrate by a remark in one of our city papers, on the late trial of BAKER for the murder of POOLE. The latter's character had been made a subject of investigation during the trial, by Baker's counsel. The city paper thus speaks:—

"The censure of the Judge upon the prisoner's counsel, for stripping the shroud as it were from the *dead Poole*, or rather for RECALLING HIM TO LIFE *such as he actually had been while among us*, appears to us to have been entirely unjust and uncalled for."

This remark shows that the idea of "a resurrection in *some sense*," short of actual *life*, is an admissable one; and until there is *positive* evidence

to the contrary—which we have not yet seen in this discussion—we must repeat what we said at the outset, we *doubt* if the wicked dead will ever have a revival into *actual life*. In the sense in which "the dead Poole" had a "recalling to life," we see no objection to admitting their resurrection.

"2." If Br. Grew has "*proved*" that the "few" or "many stripes" are to be received *after* the resurrection, we must have overlooked it. See our remarks again on this point, Vol. 10, pp. 331–2. What men will receive "hereafter" proves nothing, unless it is shown to be *after* death and in another life.

"3." As Br. G. can find no "second death" spoken of except in the *Apocalypse*, we are willing he should have the full benefit of that reference. The reader may look at our remarks on this phrase, Vol. 10, pp. 301, 331. We may add now, that we regard the expression, at the most, as no more than our Lord's assurance, Luke 20 : 36, that "they who are accounted worthy to attain that world, even a resurrection from the dead," &c., "*Neither can they die* ANY MORE," &c. The subjects of the resurrection, into actual life, are "immortal, incorruptible;" so saith our Lord, and so saith Paul, 1 Corth. 15. No man, that we can find, is to experience a second death in the sense of being *twice* deprived of life. Neither the *law* nor the *gospel* has announced any such *penalty*, that we see.

"4." The "12th verse," is a different matter entirely; but we cannot dwell upon it now, except to say, it is "*the dead*" that are spoken of, and who are judged *as dead*, and not alive. But we pass it for the present.

"5." Br. G.'s reference to Matt. 13 : 42, does not help the *affirmative*, in our mind, at all; for nothing is there said of *the dead;* it is those wicked persons who are alive at the "end of *the age*." The subject has no connection with Lk. 12 : 5, nor Rev. 2 : 11, in our judgment. On Luke 12 : 5, we beg the reader to look again at our remarks, Vol. 10, pp. 300, 331–2. The wicked who "*wail*" are *alive*, of course; but that has nothing to do with those who have died previous to the time spoken of.

"6." "The question is," Has God said He will make the wicked dead *alive*, and kill them again? Is that the *penalty* of any *revealed law*? If not, we may rest assured "justice requires" no such course, and "moral order" could not be promoted by it. So it seems to us.

RESPONSE TO H. GREW ON QUESTION 2.

"1." Br. G. thinks his "sword is a *two-edged* one." But one edge has no "*life*" to it. The "good, to the resurrection of *life:*" but there is *no life*, on the other "edge" of the "sword," for those who have "done evil"—"*condemnation*" is the extent of that edge of his sword. No *life* then, only by *inference;* the truth of which inference, we judge, should be established by at least some plain and positive testimony.

"2." We supposed Br. G. would have to admit the wicked dead are to be made alive, if at all, by the *Spirit* of God: no other view can be taken, as we can see. But Rom. 8 : 11 is a plain, and, to our mind, unequivocal statement of the fact, that the resurrection from the dead to *life* is the *peculiar* and *exclusive privilege* of those who "*are led by the Spirit.*" We will now examine this text with its connection.

At the outset, let it be remembered, there were two principal classes of teachers among the Jews—the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The latter maintained that *death* was an *eternal cessation of life* to all the race, good and evil. The Pharisees maintained a rë-embodiment, in some form, which they called a resurrection. Paul was converted from among the Pharisees; he well knew that the Sadducees held death to be cessation of life to all, without a revival. With this knowledge Paul saith in Rom. 8, "If ye live after the flesh *ye shall die.*" We perceive no reason for supposing that Paul used this language in any other sense than that understood by the Sadducees; and this is the more probable from the fact that he adds, "But if ye through the *Spirit* do mortify the deeds of the body *ye shall live.*" Thus he seems to maintain the Sadducee doctrine in relation to all those who are governed by their animal nature, or who live after the flesh; while he affirms a living from the dead of those who come under the government of the Spirit; thus far agreeing with the Pharisees: hence his position, "If the *Spirit* of Him that raised up Jesus *from the dead* dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall *also* quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you."

That the apostle makes the *quickening* by the Spirit to depend on its indwelling, seems perfectly evident; and it seems equally evident, if the person had lived after the flesh he would not be a subject of this quickening. To avoid the conclusion, Br. G. says, "The indwelling of the Spirit may be a *special* evidence to the saints of their resurrection." How can that be a "*special* evidence" when *all* are *equally* sure of being made alive by the same Spirit?

This, taken in connection with the same apostle's saying, that he labored and suffered for Christ, "*If by any means* I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead," or "out from among the dead," Phil. 3: 11, seems to put it beyond a reasonable doubt, that Paul believed in the doctrine of the Sadducees, so far as the incorrigibly wicked are concerned; and hence regarded the *re*-enlivening from the dead as a *conditional Gospel benefit*, or *privilege*, to be obtained only by self-denial, and being "led by the Spirit of God," thus becoming "the sons of God" and "joint heirs with Christ" in the *quickening* into life by the same Spirit "that raised up Christ from the dead." But we may speak more fully on this point when the *fifth* question is up for discussion.

RESPONSE TO H. GREW ON THIRD QUESTION.

"Infinite wisdom and power can easily furnish the means," says our brother; and why not add, "infinite" *goodness* will not suffer them to go *hungry and starve?* Then it might have been said, "the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance;" and so Bishop NEWTON'S supposition, of "repentance in hell," leading to heaven, might not be an improbable conjecture. *Our* "common sense" must be "*precious* little," if such a response, to the 3d question would satisfy it. But we wish not to press the question. We were aware that the statement of it would open some eyes, without arguing at all.

The way is now prepared, we believe, for *Question* 4, *viz:* "Do the Scriptures *distinctly* teach that any who are made alive by a resurrection, at the last day, are *mortal?*" We wait for the affirmative.

OUR FRIENDS AND PATRONS.

We have thought best to give, at the opening of the new year, a few specimens of the language and feelings of our Patrons. We do not in general, think best to deal largely, in the EXAMINER, with the kind expressions of our friends; which, while they are comforting to us personally, may not be so interesting to general readers. Some of the following, however, must be interesting to all.

From A. G. Merwin, Suffolk Co., N. Y.

BR. STORRS.—I am not yet ready to say "farewell" either to the EXAMINER or its Editor, though they may hold for truth what I honestly believe is error; and for this reason, if no other, that the pages of the EXAMINER are open to free discussion. Not such free discussion as dare not overstep the line of a certain creed, but freedom that will exclude no honest man who sincerely desires the truth.

It is surprising that those who advocate discussion as a means of arriving at truth, should find cause for censure when they meet with opinions at variance with their own. This variance is a necessary consequence, of allowing discussion at all. And if your paper is open to one side of a question and closed to the other, for any thing that I can see, you have nothing to boast over the most sectarian print of the country; even though you do not carry exclusion to the same extent, you admit the principle: give one side a hearing and deny it to the other.

Had you presented your views of the resurrection and refused to open the EXAMINER to us who believe that the whole, or a part of the wicked will live again, then there might have been good reason to say "farewell;" but, it is not so; you have allowed your opponents the same freedom you have taken yourself; and if others wish to be heard I believe they need not fear an exclusion. It is indeed to be regretted that we cannot all, at once, step into the full blaze of truth, but the *fact* is unquestionable—we cannot. Yet so long as all can speak, I see no cause of complaint. On the contrary, a paper open to free discussion is just what we cannot do without. If I will not have the EXAMINER because you believe there is *no* life out of Christ, I in effect say, "you must believe as I do;" and I act upon the same sectarian principle that lead the Catholics to torture and burn heretics—the Puritans to hang and banish Quakers, and that leads sectarians of the present day to cast odium on those who dare to oppose their errors.

"But it is loading our system with a weight it is poorly qualified to bear,"—"what will people say now?"—"denying the resurrection of almost all the human race!" "Just as we expected—the next step will be avowed infidelity!" Surely, "now we *know* thou hast a devil"—"we suspected it long ago,"—"and what shall we say for ourselves now?"

I shall say, both sides are presented: and on either many new thoughts; and it is not my business to enquire what people say, but *what is truth?* I am, individually, responsible to God; and the united voice of all the world cannot remove that responsibility. With me it is an axiom, that truth only can benefit me or the world. Truth can only be gained by discussion where error previously exists; and if we have discussion, I must have no opinion at all, or else meet with

those at variance with my own. I see no half-way ground between free discussion and exclusive sectarianism.

I do not know that it will interest you to tell the effect the discussion of the resurrection question has had upon my mind. Still I cannot refrain from expressing the unfeigned pleasure I have felt in observing the spirit of love—of Christ—which seems to spring spontaneously from the heart of each. It has been no religious quarrel, but a contention for the truth in love: not to see who shall utter the most cutting sayings, and gain the most applause; but to learn whose opinion is supported by the word of truth.

There is hope yet. The bond of union is not in opinions, but in love. Surely, if we would learn, the experience of the past eighteen centuries is sufficient to teach us that the cause of Christ can be forwarded by no union the bond of which is not love. The Catholic church was a union cemented and maintained by a *creed;* and the history of its horrors needs no comment; all because they were united in the bonds of *opinion;* and the same may be said of all the reformed churches. At the first they were united in love; but soon they neglected the *true bond* and substituted *a creed.* While secular prosperity has resulted, a universal consequence has been, an almost entire neglect of love to God and to one another. Indeed, it appears to me that the very moment a church organization is formed, on the basis of similarity in religious opinions, the seeds of irreligion are sown; and sooner or later they will spring up and bear much fruit. For if the organization is cemented by opinion, love is not necessarily an element. It is true, love may exist in such an organization; but it holds a secondary place; it is not essential—it is not the vital principle; and without it organizations, claiming to be christian, have been sufficiently powerful to control the destinies of nations.

Thus where opinion is the bond of union, love may or may not exist, and in so far as it does not exist, all will agree, that pure religion is absent. I think the present tendency among us is toward an organization on other principles than that of love; and the plea is surely plausible. "It will render our efforts more effectual." So it has rendered the efforts of Mahommedans, Catholics, Mormons, and all sectarians effectual; but not for good, except where love held a controlling influence. Exclude it, and organization can only produce evil. Let us be united *in love,* and let that love flow out to God and to all his creatures, and our influence must, it *will* be felt. Love moved the Almighty—it moved our Savior; and if men will not be moved by the truth, *in love,* their case is hopeless. And in my view, if love will not serve as a sufficient bond of organization, among christians, they had better be *dis*-organized to the end of time.

No, I cannot say "*farewell.*" Why should I? If love is the current, we may all move on in union, though difference of opinion produce many an eddy on the surface. Let us have *no test* but *love:* no union without love as the bond: and, though we do not become an *influential sect,* we shall have the friendship of the great God our Father, which is infinitely better than all worldly renown.

Yours in the Bonds of Love.

—

From Randolph E. Ladd.

Springfield, Mass., Dec. 1855.

Br. Storrs.—I am determined—under whatever discouragement I may be laboring, and at whatever sacrifice within my power to overcome—to sustain the Bible Examiner in any way that it may be deemed best to conduct it—monthly, semi-monthly, or weekly; though it would please me best to be the last. I do welcome its pleasant and truthful face like that of an old friend. I love its kind spirit; and approve most heartily the courtesy with which discussions are usually conducted in its columns. The manly defence of the "Faith once delivered to the saints," amid the cloud of error and folly extant, is truly refreshing to the christian's heart. You may count on my support to the extent of my ability while time continues or I live.

I am greatly indebted to your labors (under God's blessing) for the present joyful looking for of Everlasting Life through Jesus Christ our Lord. The Six Sermons, kindly given me by you in Oct., 1842, completely revolutionized my faith; and comparing that work with the Scriptures of Truth, together with the Bible Examiner, and other kindred works, since received, convinced me beyond a doubt of man's *entire mortality;* and that his *only* hope for a future life was by a resurrection from the grave.

Thanks be to God that I ever saw you and your writings. My means are limited, but what I can spare I shall devote to the spread of these glorious truths, *viz:* The near coming of the Everlasting Kingdom and its rightful King—the resurrection of the dead in Christ, at his second coming—and no future life but by a resurrection.

I will not bid you "*farewell*" as one of your

patrons has done, because you have admitted into your columns the discussion of the non-resurrection of the wicked. I am examining the subject without prejudice, and with an earnest desire to know what the *Scriptures* teach, and whatever that is, I will most devoutly believe. My views have always been in the affirmative of that question, but I am prepared and desire to change if I have been wrong. May the good Spirit direct the hearts and pens of the brethren engaged in that discussion to its conclusion. I am deeply interested in it, and am surprised at the amount of evidence presented in opposition to my belief. I promise you *one* new subscriber at least for the sister who has bid you *farewell.* —

From the "Sister in Christ."

Our subscribers of last year will recollect several extracts of letters from a young lady who had recently embraced the *Life* views. We gave them without her name, from "A *Sister in Christ.*" She now comes forward with the nobleness and self-sacrifice which may well put us, *old* believers, to shame for our want of zeal in spreading the truth of "*Life and Immortality through Christ.*" Read the following letter from her, received Dec. 15th.

"*Dear Brother Storrs.*—I suppose I ought to have sent you my name for the EXAMINER before, and probably should have, but I was not fully settled what to do; but now I have made up my mind, that you may put my name down for *thirty copies* of the volume for 1856, if for thirty dollars you will send them where I shall desire; but you must trust me; and depend on my health and ability to work for security; that holding good, I will promise to pay a third before the first of January; a third in three months and the other third in six months. If I should get many to whom I send the papers to pay for them, I will also pay you for your extra expense in sending them to different places. If my prospects were not better than they were last year, at this time, I could not take the responsibility of such a debt; but, thank the Lord, they are; and I can pay you with ease if nothing unseen arises. I presume I could get a large number of subscribers here, but that would not fulfill my design; I wish to send the light to those who are strangers to "the Faith once delivered to the saints." I will remit the first payment as soon as I know you accept my proposal. Yours in Christian love."

Certainly we "accept" her "*proposal;*" and only wish it was in our power to *give* her *without* charge all the papers she is disposed to scatter; but, alas, our funds are all exhausted, and we have been compelled to "*receive*" instead of *giving* for the last ten or twelve years. We gave by hundreds or thousands while we had it, and we shall still do all we can. This dear sister makes us feel ashamed that we have done so little. Depending on her personal efforts—*labor and health*—she takes hold in earnest. Verily, she seems to be doing more than *we* "*all.*" Some, "of their *abundance,*" have done much; but rare are the cases of such effort as that presented by this sister. May the Lord abundantly bless and prosper her, and bring her to *Life Eternal* through Jesus, our *Life-Giver* and Lord.

P. S. Since the foregoing remarks were written this sister has sent us $15, or *one half* the amount for 30 subscribers.

From Wm. B. Wade, Oswego, Ind.

Br. Storrs.—As the time has come for me to renew my subscription for your valuable paper, I herewith enclose two dollars for 24 numbers for 1856; and you will send me "*Bible vs. Tradition.*" I consider that the very best work I have seen on the subject of our faith; as it covers the whole ground of difference between us and the (so called, orthodox) sects; and I do not see how any man can evade or set aside the arguments adduced in that work. There is more divinity, more real Bible truth in that one book than there is in a whole library of many of our Reverend D.D.'s.

The cause is slowly progressing here, although we have very little preaching on the truths that we cherish. Brother CHAPLIN visits us occasionally. The brethren here are well united, and generally intelligent, and well able to defend the truth against the traditions and errors of the age. The preachers of the different sects can traduce us behind our backs—can ridicule our views in their pulpits—but there are very few of them that are willing with their Bibles in their hands, to meet us in open and manly discussion on any of the points on which we differ. I feel encouraged, and believe the truth will ultimately prevail. I can already see a different tone in the preaching of the different sects. We do not hear near as much about fire and brimstone as we used to hear from their pulpits; although their faith may be the same, they are much more cautious how they express it.

I hope your paper will be sustained. It was never more needed than at this time; and I think if the brethren would all do their duty it might well be sustained if it were published *weekly;* which would be very desirable. If it could be so, I will do what I can to obtain subscribers. If every old subscriber would obtain one new one you would have a respectable list. Can it not be done? I will try; will not all others do the same?

From M. C. Allen, Black Rock.

Br. Storrs.—I have read carefully the discussion in the EXAMINER for, and against the wicked dead being raised again to *life;* and while doing so, have endeavored to ascertain more clearly, what the Scriptures say on this subject; although, perhaps, not sufficiently to express an opinion, which as yet I cannot hold, as not being by further scrutiny, subject to change. At present I am inclined in part, to indorse your sentiments expressed in the Oct. 15th number of the EXAMINER, relating to the dispensations prior to our Savior's advent. Previous to the proclamation of the gospel, we find in the Old Testament, that to those who adhered to and obeyed GOD'S laws, were promised temporal blessings; and those who transgressed, were threatened with their deprivation; and we find those promises and threatenings were fulfilled. After the establishment of the gospel dispensation, we read no special promises or threatenings regarding the giving, or withholding worldly blessings; but attention is directed to the future life. When I come to the gospel dispensation, I find, as I peruse the New Testament, that my reason and judgment, indorses Br. GREW'S opinion expressed in the EXAMINER. And, I do understand from its contents, that for those who *hear* the gospel, whether they obey or not, there awaits "a resurrection of the just and unjust." What is the "sorer punishment," Heb. 10: 29?

I regret you do not find sufficient encouragement to publish the EXAMINER *weekly.*

From Prof. J. F. Huber, Conn.

Br. Storrs.—I should like, of course, if you could publish the EXAMINER *weekly;* but certainly you ought not to be required to labor for naught, or to make brick without mortar. I feel ashamed and grieved that so many professing to believe and love the doctrines so luminously set forth and defended in the EXAMINER, yet are so unwilling to contribute the least towards the support of your excellent paper; while they are not at all scrupulous to spend lavishly for that which is not bread.

The Lord bless, comfort and sustain you, and your dear family—direct and aid you in all your christian labors and efforts; and finally bring you to the enjoyment of Eternal Life, through Christ our blessed Savior.

From the aged Sister Catharine Colver, Mass.

Br. Storrs.—I thought I would send you a little money, thinking it will do you some good. I would send you more if I could; but the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, so he that feeds the revens can send ravens to feed his children; hence we need not fear if we trust in him. I wish I could get more subscribers. There is some talk of clubbing; but whether they will or not is rather doubtful. The work is the Lord's, and he can turn the hearts of men as the rivers are turned. There seems to be something moving in some minds; whether it is for good or for evil the Lord only knows; but, be that as it may, our course must be straight forward; whether cloudy or sun shining, it matters not; or if we travel all alone, it is all the same; we shall soon come to our resting place, where we shall rest in peace till Jesus comes to take us home. Is it not heart-cheering to think of the glory that will be revealed when Jesus comes with his heavenly host to take his children home? With what majesty will he command the grave to deliver up its victims. Then we shall sing, "Glory to God in the highest." Well did John say, "Come Lord Jesus, come quickly;" even so let it be. Yours, in hope of Eternal Life.

WHAT NEXT?

In the *Ch. Adv. and Jour.*, of the 29th inst., is a communication from "H. Mattison," of whose fame the readers of the EXAMINER have heard. The article commences thus:

"*Mr. Editor,*—I perceive by a late number of the Advocate, that our mutual friend, sister Palmer, is reviving her theory of sanctification. With this, certainly, I am well pleased; as nothing could be more necessary, unless it were that she leave the subject, with theology in general, where it properly belongs,—in the pulpits of the M. E. Church, and with the authorized teachers of religion."

The writer concludes his piece with what he terms, "a few pertinent questions;" the fourth one begins as follows:

"Would it not be as well for the Church for our sister to leave the teaching of Christ's flock where God has left it—with the CHRISTIAN MINISTRY?"

I would like to inquire of the EDITOR of the BIBLE EXAMINER, what warrant there is in the New Testament for the proscriptive counsel volunteered in the foregoing extracts. Surely it will not be claimed that the Scriptures so much as mention "The M. E. Church," or its "pulpits," though I can readily believe that the *priestly assumptions* put forth by Prof. Mattison have their origin in "the mystery of iniquity," of which the Apostle Paul speaks. If we have not in the few sentences here cited a development of *Protestant Papacy*, I fail to see any meaning in them. How does it strike you, BR. STORRS? *Who are* the

"*authorized* teachers" of "Christ's flock?" Amid the jargon and conflicting sentiments of the various sectarian parties all about us, it is important to know the truth on this point. Give us the light you have, and oblige, QUERIST.

Nov. 30, 1855.

Dec. 14. BR. STORRS:—The foregoing, as its date shows, was written a fortnight ago, I omitted to send it, thinking the Prof.'s remarkable claims in behalf of "authorized teachers" might have attracted your eye, and that possibly you would give them some Editorial attention. Number 24 of the Examiner comes, however, without any allusion to the matter. Still, I am glad I deferred sending what I had written, for *now* I am able to shield myself, in the view I have taken of Prof. M.'s language, under the indorsement of a distinguished Methodist preacher. In the *Nor. Ch. Adv.* of the 12th inst., which I have just received, Dr. ELIAS BOWEN calls attention to "the attack of Rev. Mr. Mattison upon Mrs. Dr. Palmer in the Christian Advocate & Journal," and mentions some things in the article which he "particularly disliked." He expresses the opinion that Mr. Mattison "wrested her [Mrs. P.'s] language, putting a construction upon it which misrepresented the sentiment of the author." Then—after charging Prof. M. with "treating with* *contemptuous rudeness* a respectable and pious lady"—Dr. B. rebukes in the following manner the language your "*Querist*" has quoted from the Professor:

"But what chiefly concerns me to notice in the article of Mr. Mattison is, that he should base his orthodoxy upon the consideration of *rank* or *order*. It would seem from the drift and tenor of his article that the teaching of a woman is not only out of place, but, of necessity, *erroneous* likewise; and that while it belongs *exclusively* to the *regular* ministry to give instruction, they only are capable of teaching the truth.

And has it come to this, *in the Methodist Episcopal Church*, that nothing 'irregular,' nothing 'uncanonical,' nothing out of 'the succession' is to be tolerated?—Such doctrine might be well suited to the meridian of judaism, of popery, of high-churchism. But what then would have become of the Apostles? of Luther? of Wesley? 'If these should hold their peace, the stones would cry out.' Lifeless formality, and heartless despotism, are always very *canonical* in their doings.

The crisis may have come in our history, when the Head of the Church sees it necessary to 'forbid the madness of *the prophets*,' if not by the mouth of an ass, yet by the mouth of *a woman*."

If Dr. B.'s strictures fail to open the Prof.'s eyes, I would recommend that he read with care the extracts you are giving from Dr. McCulloh in the EXAMINER.

Yours, believing in the right of *all* men to obey the injunctions of our Lord and the Apostle. "*Search the Scriptures*,"—"*Prove all things*."

RUFUS WENDELL.

In addition to what Br. WENDELL has said, it may be interesting to some of our readers to know, that while we were refused even a temperate reply in the *Christian Advocate*, last year, to Prof. M.'s scandalous and unprincipled misrepresentations, of us and our position, he is now being handled rather unceremoniously in that paper for his recent attacks on a pious Sister of the Methodist E. Church. In a late number of the *Advocate* a writer concludes an article on this redoubtable personage as follows:—

"As the gallant professor has condescended to make some unkind personal allusions, we trust he will take it kindly if we inform him that there are a host of his brethren who think his own position for the last few years has been a false one. He stands in his own conference a superannuated man. That is, one who is so far worn out as not to be able to take any work from the conference. This is his relation. Is it a true one? Is he so completely enfeebled as not to be able to do any work? Nay; he can fill a laborious station, build a church, dedicate churches, make numerous addresses, edit books, and also pursue, with a bitter pen, a plain little sister, who is trying to love the Lord with all her heart, and persuade others to do likewise.* This last employment indicates that his gallantry (if he ever had any) is superannuated, but in every other respect he seems to be a man who is able to take an effective relation in his conference, instead of standing as a worn-out old man in the Black River region, when he can do the work of two or three men in New York city. This course has been regarded as dangerous in its tendency, and hence the New York Conference at its last session passed a resolution requesting the bishop to put a stop to this kind of procedure. The resolution, however, was not regarded, and so the learned professor remains, but has given his promise (I am told) to return to his conference next year, if his brethren would leave him in his present (false position) one year more. We mention these things to let the world know who this accuser of the sister is."

---

* The *italicising* is Dr. B.'s.

* With what a "*bitter pen*" and *tongue* has he, also, pursued *us*; and, as we learn, while this "*superannuated*" Preacher is traveling far and near, he still carries on the work of misrepresenting us and our views, and striving to make some believe we were expelled from the M. E. Church! "The LORD rebuke thee."—ED. EX.

ving from Dr. McCulloh, in

he right of *all* men to obey
r Lord and the Apostle.
"—"*Prove all things.*"
RUFUS WENDELL.

; Br. WENDELL has said, it
me of our readers to know,
sed even a temperate reply
ate, last year, to Prof. M.'s
ipled misrepresentations, of
s now being handled rather
paper for his recent attacks
Methodist E. Church. In
dvocate a writer concludes
ubtable personage as fol-

essor has condescended to
onal allusions, we trust he
inform him that there are
who think his own position
has been a false one. He
ence a superannuated man.
ar worn out as not to be
rom the conference. This
true one? Is he so com-
to be able to do any work?
ous station, build a church,
e numerous addresses, edit
with a bitter pen, a plain
ing to love the Lord with
ade others to do likewise.*
dicates that his gallantry
perannuated, but in every
o be a man who is able to
in his conference, instead
out old man in the Black
an do the work of two or
k city. This course has
erous in its tendency, and
nference at its last session
esting the bishop to put a
ocedure. The resolution,
ed, and so the learned pro-
given his promise (I am
nference next year, if his
m in his present (false posi-
Ve mention these things to
his accuser of the sister is."

er pen" and *tongue* has
nd, as we learn, while this
acher is traveling far and
he work of misrepresenting
riving to make some believe
the M. E. Church! "The
D. Ex.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW YORK, JANUARY 15, 1856. NO. 2.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY
At No. 141 Fulton-street.
TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:
Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Prayer of Jesus on the Cross.

Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.—*Luke* xxiii, 34.

WE have just done contemplating the agony of Jesus in the garden, and those "prayers and supplications, with strong cryings and tears," unto Him who alone was able to help. Consequent upon these, and, doubtless, in answer to them, there seems to have been a remission of his sufferings. But that remission was but temporary, only sufficient for the powers of nature to rally, and for faith and fortitude to acquire further needful strength. Such was the tenderness of the Redeemer's spirit; such his keen sensibility to suffering, that had he not been favored with some alleviation, the lamp of life would, probably, have been extinguished ere the purposes of Infinite Wisdom had been accomplished.

That unknown and amazing agony ceased. But the tragical scenes of that eventful night went on; each one contributing to, and urging forward, the momentous catastrophe which was to follow. Jesus is betrayed—mocked—arraigned—scourged—crowned with thorns, and condemned to the death of the cross.

To that cross he is, at length, nailed; and there, on the accursed tree, the Savior of the world now hangs. * * *

While the measure of his sufferings was fast filling up, and it would seem impossible that he should not be wholly absorbed in his own intense pangs, his eye fell upon one—she was a spectator of the scene; she was poor—homeless—friendless—wretched—forlorn. For the moment, he forgot his own agony; and, with all the tenderness and sympathy of an affectionate son, he commended her to the care and kindness of the "beloved disciple," who was also near. "Woman," said he, "behold thy son?" "Disciple, behold thy mother!"

When or where, in the annals of filial love, was there a parallel to this? And, yet, in that bosom whence proceeded that filial love, there was a deeper, holier current; a tide flowing forth, and having for its object those who were now mocking his agonies, and thirsting for his blood. "Father!" said he—though that Father's face was hid from him, and he might no longer pray for himself, nor for a mitigation of his own personal sufferings—yet he might pray for his murderers—for the mockers of his pangs—and he does pray: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Hark, how he prays! The charming sound
Dwells on his dying lips,
And every groan and gaping wound
Cries: "Father! let the rebels live!"

The "Evangelical Prophet" had, seven hundred years before, foretold that he would "make intercession for the transgressors," (Isa. 53: 12;) and here that prophecy is fulfilled. He had himself inculcated the love of enemies—the forgiveness of injuries—and prayer for those who should despitefully use and persecute; and the rule which he had prescribed for others, he now illustrates by his own noble and sublime example.

The question has been raised: Whom did Jesus embrace in his supplication for forgiveness? Two distinct classes were accessory to his crucifixion—Romans and Jews. The former were the immediate agents; the latter, the instigators. Both, however, were ignorant of the enormity of their guilt. Paul says, "that had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory." This ignorance Jesus urges as a *reason* why God should pardon them. In respect to the Romans, they were really ignorant that he was the Son of God; nor had they, perhaps, any means of distinguishing between him and the malefactors who were crucified with him. But the Jews were better informed; at least, they knew that he was *innocent*, and they might have learned his true character. The prejudices, under the influence of which they regarded him, had the effect to render them incapable of fairly estimating the evidence which he adduced, that he was the true Son of God. They were, therefore, guilty, especially the rulers, who were better situated to inform themselves as to his true character. All, indeed, might have arrived at the truth—for the light shone bright and glorious, but they loved darkness better than light, because their deeds were evil.

It was, however, a time of love and compassion when Jesus was on the cross. It was right that this "morn of mercy" should be signalized by the voice of prayer, ascending from Him who was expiating human guilt. It was a glorious act—thus to antedate, if we may so speak—the application of his blood, to wash out the deep moral stains of those who were about to shed it. It was a pledge and presage of the efficacy of the atoning work of Jesus. If he could ask blessings on the heads of murderers amid the agonies of crucifixion—how might he not be supposed to intercede when the bitterness of death should have passed, and the

glorious work of expiation should have been accomplished!

To the men of the world, such kindness and compassion may seem inexplicable. They are governed by no such motives: are influenced by no such love: can feel no such duty. But here they may learn, from the example of Jesus, what his religion inculcates. Is it difficult so to act? That may well be granted. It is difficult. To bear reproaches and persecutions with patience; to bless those who are seeking our ruin; and, more than all, to pray in kindness and sincerity for them, is difficult. But Jesus did it: Stephen did it: Paul did it; and thousands, governed by the same love, have thus honored the sublime and glorious inculcations of the gospel.

What a different world had this proved, had the example of Jesus been strictly followed, since he presented it on the cross! Ah! those fires of revenge—intense and consuming—had never burned; those persecutions—those murders—those midnight assassinations, had never polluted the pages of our history. Those wars which have made wives widows, and children orphans, had never been waged. The walls of a thousand dungeons had not reverberated with the clanking of the chains of the incarcerated victims of revenge; nor had they started, at their curses upon the guilty authors of their sufferings.

Well, disciples of Jesus! let the world pass on, and continue its revengeful fires, if it please. Let passion rage; let anger burn; but let us, taking a lesson from the precepts and example of Jesus—like him pity; like him pray; like him forgive. Is this difficult? Yes; difficult, but not impossible. By grace we can accomplish it: by grace we can do all duty and practice all self-denial. Let this prayer daily, hourly ascend to Him who has set a sublime and glorious example, and he will help us to follow it.

Make us, by thy transforming grace,
Dear Savior, daily more like thee!
Thy fair example may we trace,
To teach us what we ought to be!

Oh, how benevolent and kind!
How mild!—how ready to forgive!
Be this the temper of our mind,
And these the rules by which we live.

[*Bible History of Prayer.*

The Resurrection from the Dead Opposed to the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul.

(Continued from page 4.)

THE ANGELS WHICH KEPT NOT THEIR FIRST ESTATE, spoken of in Jude, we notice merely because it has been adduced in this controversy; though, as being evidently unconnected with it, that notice will be necessarily brief. "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he has reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." (Verse 6.) We submit, that whatever opinions the phraseology of this passage may have given rise to, that of authorizing the doctrine of an intermediate state for the souls of men, it is not chargeable with; for it speaks *not* of men, *not* of souls, *not* of a state of darkness for the souls of men; nor does it give the slightest countenance to Bishop Bull's general theory, that "the souls of all the wicked are presently after death in a state of very great misery, and yet dreading a far greater misery at the day of judgment."

From this passage we proceed to one in Peter, where mention is made of Christ as *preaching to the spirits in prison*. "By which also, he" (Jesus) "went and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient: when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water." (1 Peter iii. 19, 20.) From these verses it has been contended, that the apostle assumes an intermediate state of conscious existence: but in attending to this passage we have to remind our readers, that as it regards the term "spirits," we have already amply proved that it has not only various significations, but that in a connection like the present, the translator should most unequivocally have placed in its stead either the term "persons," or "minds," and then the true meaning of the apostle could not well have been controverted. We shall now proceed to the examination of the passage, by continuing the same principles of inquiry which we have previously adopted—that of looking at the connexion, and the general scope and object of the writer: from whence we feel confident of proving, that it gives no support to the doctrine of immaterial spirits, and that it has no reference to an intermediate, or indeed, to any state of *future* existence. Peter commences his letter by addressing it to the believers "scattered abroad;" exhorting them to withstand persecution, such being "the trial of their faith;" (which faith was "more precious than that of gold, which perisheth,") and as an example to them, the sufferings of Jesus are referred to, "that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit;" that is, raised from the dead by the spirit of God—"by the power of God." The same idea we find expressed by Paul, though in somewhat different language: "though he was crucified, yet he liveth by the power of God:" (2 Cor. xiii. 4.) by which (power or authority) "he went and preached unto the spirits," (persons) "in prison;" or in other language, to those whose "*minds*" were imprisoned; being in that state of darkness, which in the succeeding chapter is represented as one of death: "for the gospel was preached also to them that are dead:" (1 Peter iv. 1, &c.) that is, "dead in trespasses and sins." And thus, such persons—spirits—being morally and mentally in prison, to them Jesus, by preaching and proclaiming the gospel, broke their fetters, and released them from prison, in the sense in which moral delivery is spoken of in Isaiah. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." (Isa. lxi. 1.) So that an attention to the connection becomes essential, as also a correct understanding of the phraseology peculiar to the scriptures. This will be more fully seen in Isaiah's prophecy of

the mission of him who, in Peter's language, *preached to the spirits in prison*. "I, the Lord, have called thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the gentiles, to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." (Isa. xlii. 6, &c.) Looking, therefore, at the phraseology of corresponding passages as to what state they were in, and who the spirits were to whom Jesus "*preached*," this passage ceases to be of difficult solution: but had not Isaiah thus furnished an easy illustration, the connexion of the apostle's argument in the after verses would have effected that object; the intention of the writer being to draw a parallel between those persons in a state of mental darkness, in the days of Noah, and in the apostolic age; which intention would have been rendered more obvious if our translators had introduced a single supplemental word, as they have so frequently done in other instances, to express the sense of the original: the passage would then have stood thus—"By which he went and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime"—or, as the original imports, in former time—"were disobedient: *as* when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah," &c. And, to complete his parallel, it will be seen the apostle proceeds to show that the ark was then the means of saving the believers of the antediluvian world, as *baptism*, or a public acknowledgment of the messiahship of Jesus, was the means of saving the believers in the Jewish world. Such then clearly being the scriptural import of "*preaching to the spirits in prison*," we submit, that the hypothesis relative to immaterial spirits, and their residence in an intermediate state, has most distinctly, in this connexion, no countenance; and while we differ with Law, Priestley, and others, in some particulars upon this passage, that difference affords no aid to our opponents; for although these writers apply it to the gentiles only, our application of it to both Jews and gentiles, to all in fact whose minds were "*in prison*," is only a more extensive use of the same principles of argument; and should an exception be taken to these views from the fact, that Jesus did *not* preach to the gentiles, we should reply, that his authorizing the apostles to do so will be seen, in scriptural language, to be the same thing—thus Paul, in his letter to the Ephesians, "for he" (Jesus) "is our peace, who hath made both one; and came and preached peace to you" (gentiles) "which were afar off, and to them that were nigh." (Ephes. ii. 17, &c.)

The "*spirits of just men made perfect*," (Heb. xii. 23) and "*the souls of them that were slain for the word of God*," (Rev. vi. 9) are the passages which next claim our attention. Commencing with the former, we shall first state the value of the passage in the estimation of our opponents; that it "signifies the best state to which an unembodied spirit can come;" but that after the day of judgment, spirits will then be embodied; that "as soon as good Christians depart out of this life, they will join the company of them"—(unembodied spirits.) The passage, however, will be seen to fail as completely in proving the point for which it is adduced, as those upon which we previously have been remarking; for it relates to believers in the present state of existence only, and to the distinguished honors and privileges to which they are called, and has no reference to immaterial spirits, or to a state prior to the resurrection, in which such spirits will be "*made perfect*." It will be found that the writer, in figurative and bold language, exhorts those whom he addresses "to follow peace with all men, without which no man shall see the Lord; looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; for you are come to the general assembly and church of the first-born," (i. e. the Christian church); "to God, the judge of all—to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant." (Heb. xii. 15, 23, &c.) In a corrected translation, however, of this passage, it reads thus: "Ye are come to the general assembly and congregation of the first born, and to God, the judge of all, and to just men made perfect." But if this translation be questioned, and the word "*spirits*" still retained, we should contend, from what has been clearly shown to be the meaning of that term, that there is not any thing in the passage expressive of immaterial existence, distinct and separate from the entire living man, in the present life. Mr. Belsham, however, defends his omission of "*spirits*," both by a reference to the original, and the use of the term in parallel passages; from which he contends, "The spirit of man, is a man himself; the spirit of God, is God himself;" (see 1 Cor. ii. 11) "the spirit of Timothy, is Timothy himself:" (see 2 Tim. iv. 22) "the spirits of just men, therefore, are just men themselves. By this interpretation the author appears to be intelligible and consistent; but if by the '*spirits of just men made perfect*,' we understand separate souls in an intermediate state, the observation is not only irrelevant, but it is not true; for in what sense can believers in Christ be said to be *now* introduced into the society of spirits in heaven? or what privilege have they in this respect above good men under the law?" And the perfection here spoken of is clearly that which as members of the "assembly of the first-born," they ought to attain to, because of the superior privileges the gospel confers upon them, and can have no reference, as Dr. Priestley has observed in his notes on this passage, to any condition of good men, or of spirits, in a future world.

In the Revelations, the passage in which the writer states, "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held," (Rev. vi. 9) though adduced by our opponents with much confidence, has not what perhaps might be conceded to some of the preceding passages, even the semblance of an argument in their favor; for, as we have previously proved relative to the word soul, it is clear that in the present instance it should have been rendered by the term "lives;" then, in that case, the representation of such being under the altar, will be seen to be perfectly appropriate; forming as the verse does, part of a most highly figurative representation of the opening of the six seals; in which the stars from heaven are said to

be falling, and the mountains and islands moving out of their places; and the particular allusion in the sixth verse, appears to be borrowed from the practice at the altar of victims in the temple; at the foot of which altar the *blood* (*the life—the soul*) was poured out, which blood, being in the sight of the sanctuary, it was supposed that it apprised God of the sacrifice that had been offered to him, and that he saw it; thus the lives of those who had sacrificed themselves in the cause of revelation, are here in bold and figurative language, described as being under the altar, in the sight of God.

From these passages we turn to one which chronologically ought to have preceded them, but because of its minor importance in our view of the argument, we have reserved it to the last—it is that of *Saul and the witch of Endor*, (1 Sam. xxviii,) which some of our opponents deem to prove both the existence of immortal souls, and also an intermediate state for their reception:—thus Cousin, as quoted by Coward, contends that the return of souls, as in the case of the prophet Samuel, is appointed by God to prove their immortality. A modern writer also, of some celebrity, asserts that "we have one remarkable instance of a *phantom*, or appearance, in the form of Samuel the prophet; and it is not improbable that it was the departed spirit of Samuel himself, appearing, not by the incantation of the witch, but by the will of God, to denounce his awful vengeance against Israel." [The case of Saul, by Granville Sharpe, p. 155–157.] Patrick, on this chapter, maintains that it was an evil spirit in the likeness of Samuel that appeared before Saul: and others have supposed that the appearance of Samuel to Saul, was a divine miracle. [See Dr. Waterland's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 267.] In forming a judgment of this case, apart from the uses to which it has been applied, it may be well to glance at the characters who are represented as acting in it:—first, The king of Israel, who upon disobeying the commands of Deity, was told, that "*the Lord had rejected him from being king over Israel*," and who in all his subsequent engagements with the enemies of Israel, was defeated by them; the cause too of such defeats was known by the whole people to be that the God of Israel had rejected him to reign over them; in consequence of which he was oppressed with melancholy: (or, in Old Testament language, "an evil spirit came upon him;") and "when he saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly troubled him: and he inquired of the Lord, and the Lord answered him not. Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may inquire of her." The second personage in this representation, is the woman so selected; one, whose occupation agreed with the necromancers of the heathen nations, "who summoned the spirits of the dead to appear before them; and who carried on their trade in subterranean caverns, which were well calculated to ensure successful imposition." [See Micheales's Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, vol. iv. p. 83–92. 8vo. edit. 1814.] But the God of Israel had prohibited the exercise of such arts; commanding his people, that "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, there shall not be one who maketh his son nor his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observance of times; or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer; for all that do these things are an abomination to the Lord, and because of these abominations, the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee." (Deut. xix.) The third character, assumes to be that of Samuel, whom "all Israel, from Dan even to Bersheba, knew to be a prophet of the Lord," and who, when he "died, all the Israelites were gathered together, and lamented him, and buried him in his house at Ramah." With these facts before us, we come to the chapter under examination, in which the defenders of immaterialism would fain make God to sanction that which he had solemnly denounced, as an abomination in his sight; which is supposed to confer upon one whom he had commanded to be "cast out of the land," the power to raise from the dead even a prophet of God, and through whose instrumentality, although Jehovah would not answer Saul, "*neither by dreams, nor by urim, nor by prophets*," yet he is made to answer him by the power of one that had "*a familiar spirit*;" for it is in vain for Mr. Granville Sharpe to attempt to get over this difficulty by asserting, that the communication was not made "by the incantations of the witch, but by some respectable agent of the divine will,"—the text being, "Then said the woman" (to Saul) "Whom shall I bring up unto thee? and he said, Bring me up Samuel: and when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice," &c. (verse 11 and 12.) So that we may well leave to the doctrine of our opponents whatever benefit the immaterial system can derive from such serious imputations, which their hypothesis casts upon the divine government; and we would beside put it to these parties, how immaterialism can be reconciled with the present relation, and how that which is spiritual and not visible to the sight, can be *seen* to be "an old man covered with a mantle;" but the whole case is clearly one of imposition dexterously practiced upon the weak, desponding, and superstitious mind of Saul, and that effected clearly by the practice of the art of ventriloquy—an art, of which not only the effects, but the causes which produce them are now so well understood. "The term '*ventriloques*' is compounded of *ventor*, belly, and *loquor*, to speak; and is applied to persons who speak inwardly, so that the voice proceeding out of the thorax seems to come from some distance, and in any direction," (see Rees's Cyclopædia—in which is quoted the work of M. de la Chapelle, published in 1772, entitled "Le Ventriloque;" who shows, that in the case of Saul, the speech *supposed* to be addressed to him by Samuel, proceeded from the mouth of the sorceress of Endor, and that the ancient oracles derived their influence from the exercise of this art;) and upon looking at the whole of this case we cannot better express our views than in the following brief summary: Firstly, that the whole was a mere juggle; Secondly, that the Hebrew of the "*familiar spirit*" which the witch had, is "*ob*," and the plural "*oboth*;"

and such persons were afterwards denominated "*Pythonesses*," which implies a pretence to divination; accordingly, in the vulgate version of 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, 8, the word used is "*Python*;" Thirdly, that the witch must have necessarily known Saul, who "*from his head and shoulders was taller than any man*" in Israel; and Fourthly, that Saul throughout the whole performance did not of himself *see* Samuel; the relation being—"When the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice," &c. (verse 12) and Saul said to her "what sawest thou;" (verse 13) "and he said unto her, What form is he of?" (verse 14) and, in the same verse, when she had answered the foregoing question, Saul "*perceived*," or acknowledged from the representation of the witch, that it was Samuel. So that the deception upon Saul completely succeeded; and he "*stooped with his face upon the ground and bowed himself*." And it is especially deserving of remark, that the whole of the after relation made to Saul, while thus prostrate before the sorceress, consists in a repetition of what had been *long previously announced concerning his rejection by God and of the triumph of the Philistines over him*, and which was known to the Jewish people at large. And the whole case is clearly one of dexterous imposition; and, consequently, not ill-suited to support the immaterial and intermediate doctrines by the enlightened aid of necromancy and juggling.

We have now but very briefly to notice those expressions of scripture which, in the view of our opponents, *imply* an intermediate state. The first and chief of such expressions being the scriptural use of the term "*sleep*;" which is thus argued—"Death you say is sleep. What is sleep? is the mind, during this torper of the body utterly and always void of thought? Death, if it reduces the mind to a total insensibility, must be something more than sleep; for in sleep there is often a strong consciousness at least, if not a kind of separate existence." And it is contended that 'to sleep,' or 'to sleep with the'r fathers,' is only "a state of inaction, or kind of insensibility, during which we still exist." To which *we* reply that we do *not* say sleep *is* death, but that, in the scriptures, as in other writings, it is often used in a figurative sense, to express death; in proof of which, we are quite willing to rest upon two of the cases that are brought to prove an opposite hypothesis: first, that of Stephen; of whom, when he was put to death, it is said he "*fell asleep*;" and, secondly, that of Lazarus, when raised from the dead by Jesus, who thus addresses his disciples—"Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go that I may awake him out of his sleep; then said his disciples, if he sleep he shall do well; howbeit, Jesus spake of his death: but they thought that he had spoken of taking rest in sleep: then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead." (John xi.) So that the play upon the word "sleep" will not avail the argument of our opponents; for, most clearly in the passages in debate, "death" is *not* merely something more than the word "sleep," but the latter is figuratively used to express the former; and the apostle Paul sets this matter completely at rest in his argument to prove the resurrection; (which will be entered into at large in our next number) in which there is no evidence to countenance an immediate entrance upon futurity at the moment of death; in which there is no hint given of an intermediate state; but, in which, the fact of the resurrection of Jesus being admitted, then the reasoning is—not that there *was*, not that there *is* at death, but that there *will be* a future life, which is made to rest solely on the resurrection from the dead; if there be no resurrection "*then they also that are fallen asleep*" (i. e. that are dead—that are non-existent) "*in Christ are perished*." (1 Cor. xv., 8.)

It will also be found that the state of death besides, being represented in the scriptures by the idea of sleep, is also said to place man in that condition in which he is at rest; that it is a "resting place," a house, a state of "silence," of oblivion, of destruction and corruption; [See Bishop Law's Theory, p. 388.) and thus the following passages have fairly no difficulty or equivocation attached to them—"*Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace*;" (Gen. xv. 15.) "*Going to the grave mourning*;" (Gen. xxxvii. 35.) "*Going down to the pit*;" (Isaiah xxxviii, 18.) and numerous parallel passages; the whole of which, however, will be found to be simply and easily explained by the following instances in which the same expressions are used and for the same object:—thus Bathsheba addresses David for the purpose of getting his appointment, in the event of his own death, of her son Solomon to reign over Israel; "otherwise, it shall come to pass, when he shall sleep with his fathers, that I and my son Solomon shall be counted as offenders." (1 Kings i. 20, 21.) And, in the following chapter, the death of David is recorded in corresponding terms—"So David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David." (ii. 10.) Again in Job—"As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." (Job xiv. 10, 11.)

Having now gone through, in the first place, every case which has been, or, we believe, can be, advanced by our various opponents, in support of their theory; and, in the second, having examined the "many expressions that *imply* an intermediate and separate state," we are placed in a condition to estimate the grounds of Dr. Jortin's confession, that of such a state "the scriptures have not said so much as one could wish;" though in truth, the Doctor ought to have acknowledged that the scriptures say not any thing of such a state, that the futurity which *they* promise is not one which we commence upon immediately at the dissolution of the body and by virtue of a never-dying principle within us; but is one far removed from that period: "When all that are in their graves" (not in an intermediate state) "shall hear the voice of the son of man, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of condemnation." (John v. 28, &c.)

(To be continued.)

From Eld. J. B. Cook, Rochester.

Dear Br. Storrs:—We are entering on a new year that will I am quite sure be a most eventful one to Israel, the Gentiles in power, and the world. The evidence of a crisis near has greatly increased; though we do not "*know*" precisely how near.

All the scripture evidence that we have had, we have still; and it has been gradually accumulating, till we "*know he* is nigh—even at the doors." Matt. 24.

The assertion of an opposite theory—"original throughout—which no writer has ever" seen or stated before, is founded in utter mistake. But the mistake as to history, Geography and Prophecy, is not allowed to appear. The only review, known to have been written has been rejected; though written with the greatest care, and based on the *facts* of the case. Thus those journals practically deny all the freedom for truth they have professed. More I shall not now say. The brotherhood have a right to know this cause of my silence. Adieu.

Yours, J. B. Cook.

—

Note by the Editor.—The foregoing letter from Br. Cook was received a few day since. The following article was received from him a short time previous, and we give it place as due to him for having been excluded from other papers where sentiments on prophecy are countenanced which he feels it his duty to oppose; but is not permitted a reply, because somebody thinks he is "too personal." To those periodicals he alludes in the foregoing letter, and the following is his defence.

—

PERSONALITIES.

Several have spoken of my *personalities* in controversy. Very well. But it may be allowed that I speak also; seeing that I am interested, and that the subject lies in my mind, in a form that it does not at all in the mind of the complainant. I would give *no* cause for complaint—but I humbly submit, that it is a question of principle with me.

1. No one should complain, I conceive, who has not been as cordial and earnest in sustaining *the truth*, which I was striving to maintain, or who has not been more in sympathy with the truth than with the person objected to. God and truth are first.

2. This consideration, though not plead as a justification, should perhaps abate, or modify the complaint. "Respect of persons" seems to sway almost every body. This is human weakness. The fact may be seen now, in all directions, as at the 1st Advent, "One was for Paul; another for Apollos." But the rest may be for nobody in earth or heaven—save themselves!

Again there are a precious few who realize that "their *life*" is at stake in handling the word of life. "My words (saith Jesus) are spirit and they are life." It is then for our life that we get and "eat the word,"—and well digest it. This should be the great end of life to get and apply aright, the Gospel's saving message. Therefore, "respect for persons"—regard for self (in the usual sense) should be altogether subordinate; though it is too often allowed to rule. The word of God and the corresponding events, in our world's history is our standard of evidence.

What then shall be done,—seeing that *all* admit the principle in words more or less? I reply, that each cherish the principle,—cultivate the principle, and apply the principle till it becomes the *governing* principle of life, that is—to love God—God as revealed (as the life giver, in and through Jesus Christ) *supremely*. Business and books, friends and favors, health and life should be always and in all things subordinate. Then I conceive we can not get far away from right.

It is I think *our* mutual imperfections in regard to the first principles of piety (that is our failure to make Divine truth—God as made known in his word—*supreme*) that causes alienation. Misunderstandings are not very material however, I conceive, where truth or God is first in all things. Those who are *one* "in spirit"—in principle—in effort, (it should seem) must be not far apart; save in appearance. But what rule can we adopt? Let the mind of each be *free*. But keep before all, the obligation to make "God over all," first; and then, men second, and *self, not at all;* for it is by this door that the devil is ever dodging in to scatter his "tares."

The first and greatest and best thing in the world is to tell "*the truth*." If the world ends, or the heavens fall, tell the "truth." This being the aim of my efforts, I speak plainly and pointedly. To me it seems *a virtue*. But those who go around, thinking what "men" will say, must do the best they can, We must be free to speak the *truth*. The spirit that restrains the truth out of respect for men is not—can not—be of God. "Brethren, if any of you do *err* (go astray) from the truth (by following a theoretic spirit) and one convert (turn back) him; let him know that he (who turns back such a sinner from a false way) shall save a soul from death," &c. Jas. 5. "He that is *first* in his own cause, seemeth *just;* but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him." Prov. 18: 17. "Whatsoever doth make manifest (or plain) *is* light." Eph. 5: 13.

Now when one so applies an isolated prophecy, or portion of truth, as to cross history, falsify geography, and contradict the general tenor of prophecy—when we *know* that this is done—the truth of scripture and the evidence of fact should be allowed to shine on the subject and on those who are so far erring "from the truth." Alas for those who stand in the way of God's purpose to correct error. His counsel will stand—not man's.

"But *you* decide—*you* judge"! says the objector. No, friend; "*not*" when the Divine word, and the acknowledged history, and the geographic locality embraced, can be so shown as to confront if not correct the theorist. Still the "*first* in his

cause" is wiser than you, and the presumption is that he is "*just*" and right! Mark! It is only a presumption; and God's rule is to let the neighbor "search"—a denial of which shuts out that "light" which "doth make manifest." When the effort has once been made then it should be left, as a good judgment would dictate. But *no one* has a right to hinder the effort.

PERSONALITIES are often mis-conceived, or in a bad sense oft do not exist. That is *not* personal in a bad or objectionable sense, which exposes *error;* and is designed to turn back a "brother" from his error. When a "new and startling" position is taken of universal concern, it needs (if wrong) to be exposed. But this cannot be done without naming the error, its *origin*, and its antagonism to the truth of God. *Personal* references for such purposes are commendable—the "light" thus "shines." But when the personal history and trials, and temptations (that are *not* embraced in the subject) are *lugged in*, to forestall conviction—when "mad dog" is unjustly cried, and *he* pointed out with scorn to set all against *him;* then it is *personal* in a wrong, an *un*-christian sense; such personalities no one should indulge or allow. If I have done this it is wrong. My care is to avoid every thing of this nature.

Every editor has a right and is bound to judge for his own work, subject however, to the highest law of the christian life—"Let your light shine"—"convert the sinner," (leading off from God's truth) "from the error of his way"—"search him," who only at first "*seems* just," &c. Truth if told must expose its opposite.

"*Plainness of speech*" is Apostolic: 2 Cor. 3. It is not a sin; but a high, Christian virtue. If any poor mortal gets in *its* way, or is exposed by *it*, then it is "the light" of God shining on "the way." It should be allowed to shine. Only *tell the truth*, and then the shorter and plainer, the better.

"*Be courteous*", is a command; but this command toward our neighbor can not crowd aside "the *first and great* command," to love God supremely: that is, to make God and truth *first*. But many suppress God's truth and God's authority from human sympathy—from a *false* courtesy.

My aim is to give "no offence." But in whatever community as soon as it shall appear that I may not "*obey God* rather than man," my duty there is done. But patience must have its perfect work.

"THE TRUTH" is divine. It is God revealed by his word and providence. Every adverse idea; every diverse theory must perish. "EVERY PLANT which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up. Thus saith the Lord." "DAGON set up" by the Ark of God, must be thrown down! If they "set him up again"; then he must be *broken to pieces*, that no one may "go into the temple of Dagon any more!" 1 Sam. 5: 2, 3. This applies to *me* and to all alike. If I get out a theory or plan of prophetic fulfillment that crosses (or to an intelligent, honest mind seems to cross) the facts of history and positive statements of prophecy, it must be open to correction. No man offends against God or good men by calling attention to such matters. If it were only a matter of opinion it might pass; or be met by a counter opinion.

The Lord said "*Prove me*"! Mal. 3: 10. Jesus said to Thomas "reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless but believing," John 20: 25, 27. Paul commended the Bereans who searched the Scriptures to see whether his preaching was true. "THE WORD" unsustained by fact—not justified by the event, *proved* the author a false prophet. Deut. 18: 20, 22.

Now as God Almighty, Jesus Christ, and the Living *Word* of the Holy Ghost, may be tested and *proved* for the purpose of securing a ground of justifying faith—who among mortals, shall be above examination? The truth is above all—exposes all as helpless and hopeless, ignorant and guilty—and is adapted to bring us to Christ, for "*wisdom*, righteousness, sanctification and redemption;" that "when we glory, we should glory in the Lord."

J. B. COOK.

From Ursula Eaton, Ohio.

Br. Storrs.—With a feeling of thankfulness I "take my pen," but not "to bid you '*Farewell!*'" "*I* have read" the "EXAMINER for many years with great comfort and satisfaction; for which *I* feel truly grateful: and when the discussion commenced, on the subject of the resurrection of the wicked dead, I expected Br. STORRS would take scripture ground, and defend" the truth, as *he* understood it, laid down in the Bible. What if "your enemies" do "say, your next change will be to embrace universal salvation"?

Now, there are many kinds of "*enemies*." Some may be like Jeremiah's "familiars" watching for the halting of the Lord's servants. But yours, it appears, are not of that class; nevertheless, they are "*enemies*." May be they are "wolves in sheeps' clothing," and when they get into the fold they scatter the sheep. Ah, yes, they scatter the sheep that are not fully weaned from the pasture wherein grows sectarianism, bigotry, and in a word, the bias of early education. What a mercy it is to have grace given, and moral courage sufficient, to strive to *grow* in the knowledge of the truth, unawed by enemies, or unseduced by friends.

Perhaps on some points I should differ with Br. STORRS. But shall I bid him "*Farewell*" on that account? By no means. Discussion in a christian spirit, I think, is beneficial. May the Lord reclaim all his erring children, and guide them into all truth, is the prayer of

Your constant Reader.

☞ It is our work to *cast* care; God's work to *take* care. Distrustful care is a canker that doth waste and dispirit. Care adds much to our grief, nothing to our comfort.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 15, 1856.

From W. H. Barnes, Montezuma, Iowa.

Br. Storrs,—I have the pleasure to see our number of subscribers for the BIBLE EXAMINER more than doubled, for the year 1856. I find that rig'd opposition to the doctrine of "*Life only* through *Jesus Christ*," is in a great measure subsiding, and people are becoming willing to examine the subject. This is all that we can ask in order to the establishment of the truth; i. e., candid investigation. We had a Discussion here on the 23—26th of Oct. last, with an Orthodox minister, on the present and intermediate state of man; and the final destiny of the wicked. We found it hard work to keep our opponent in sight of the written rules agreed upon for the discussion; and not until he was decided out of order, by the moderators, could he be kept to the question at all. I have, however, no time or room now to give anything farther, than to say, that since the discussion, it seems to be much easier to introduce the BIBLE EXAMINER, and other books in defence of the same doctrine held by it, than it was before; and in a word, we believe the cause is onward henceforward with us here; but more anon.

We have strong hopes of seeing the EXAMINER *weekly* for 1856; and rather than it shall fail to be issued weekly, I will pledge $10 more than the amount already sent, within thirty days after I receive the first number for 1856. Will others do likewise? In hope of heaven through Jesus Christ alone.

—

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—Br. BARNES has done nobly for the EXAMINER; and is entitled to the palm in the amount sent us for the EXAMINER for this year, viz: $32. Considering the far off region where he is located, and the success he has met with in obtaining subscribers, we do not wonder he had "strong hopes" that the EXAMINER would be issued "weekly." The fact is, it ought to be done; yet *we* court not the labor of such a work; and it is impossible with present prospects to accomplish it this year. Not more than one-fourth of the necessary number of subscribers have yet been received; but a *semi-monthly* will be continued, if our life and health are preserved through the year, and nothing unforeseen befalls us. For such an issue our prospects were never more encouraging than at this time; for which we thank all our friends; and we are learning who among the professed believers in "*Life only through Christ*" are in favor of a *free* paper. *Sectarian* we hope and pray we may never become, having once escaped from that corruption. We do not mean by a "*free* paper," one that is free for the *Editor* but for no others. We know such a paper is free in nothing but its profession. We do not, indeed, suppose a paper must discuss every topic any person might wish, to make it free: but if the *Editor* introduces a topic he is bound to give the opponents of that topic a fair and candid hearing, or his paper is not free. To vex and perplex those who differ from him with *rules*, which are of his own manufacture, or with quibbling about the writer's want of *humility*, &c., is clear evidence that the *Editor* is sectarian: *his* views must not be controverted! He is wise enough for himself and every body else! So, on the other hand, those who withhold support to a free paper because the *Editor* differs from them, on some topics, show themselves sectarian, and all their professions of being *free* are mere pretence—they deceive themselves. They know not what true freedom is any more than those sectarian *Editors* of whom we have just spoken—they are free to utter their own views, but wish the *Editor* not to utter his, unless they agree with theirs!

Br. BARNES has been a Methodist minister; but he has become a free man, and seems determined to maintain his freedom. May the Lord bless and guide him.

Is there Positive Testimony that the Wicked Dead will be made Alive?
H. Grew's Sixth Rejoinder to Respondent.

Dear Brother,—If I am not taxing your patience and that of your readers too much, I will offer a few more suggestions before the subject of the resurrection of the wicked dead, is dismissed from your valued periodical. It appears to me that Respondent overlooks the validity of inferential reasoning. If the inference is necessarily involved in the premises, it is conclusive. If the wicked dead cannot hear the voice of the Savior and come forth to the resurrection of condemnation without being made alive, the testimony of Jesus in John 5: 28, 29, is conclusive proof of that fact. So of Rom. 2d chap., and other passages which I have quoted. If "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," (*i. e.* "judge *the world*," Acts 17: 31.) "every man"; Rom. 2: 6; "every soul of man that doeth evil," "Jew" and "Gentile," v. 9, is to suffer "*tribulation and anguish*," it necessarily follows that they must be made *alive* to suffer it.

I submit that the terms used in this chapter, clearly teach that the apostle is not referring to the judgment of any particular nation, or to those only who will be alive on the earth at the coming of the Lord Jesus, but to "THE day" of general judgment "of MEN," which the sacred scriptures abundantly reveal. The apostle not only uses the terms "every man"; "every soul of man that doeth evil," "the Jew first and also the Gentile," but he includes those who have "*sinned* (past tense) without law," and those who have sinned in the law," which expressions, include those who had sinned previous to the Gospel day. It is indeed true that the terms, "the world," "all the world," &c., may sometimes be used in reference only to the living, as the connection plainly teaches; but surely, this is no proof that the same terms may not be used in the more comprehensive sense, including both the living and the dead. That persons who are destroyed in one general ruin by earthquakes, &c.; do not receive the "few" and "many stripes," "according to the deeds done in the body," appears to me to be a palpable fact needing no proof.

In respect to the Almighty having pleasure in the punishment of the impenitent, I supposed the simple quotation, "It pleased the Lord to bruise him (his Son) he hath put him to grief," would be sufficient for my intelligent brother; clearly proving, that if he was pleased to put his Son to such suffering, that he might be just and the justifier of sinful men, he may be pleased to put the impenitent to suffering for the display of his justice. However, as my respected brother acknowledges that the wicked *will actually die forever*, although the Almighty, has no pleasure in their death, he may as well acknowledge that they may actually endure antecedent "tribulation," &c., although the Lord has no pleasure therein.

The literal import of the term "second death," necessarily implies a "*second deprivation of life.*" I cannot admit my brother's authority to reject that import.

Some persons may wonder that I have not adduced, 1 Cor. 15 : 22, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." I have not adduced it, because I think that the phrase IN Christ, and indeed the apostle's description of the raised, limits this verse to the righteous. I am not a Universalist. I believe that the wicked will be raised BY Christ, but not IN him.

Respectfully submitted, HENRY GREW.

Respondent's Reply to the Foregoing.

As Br. GREW has brought forward no new argument, in the foregoing remarks, we might pass it without any response. A protracted examination would only compel us to travel the ground over again already passed, which we do not think would be edifying to our readers. Those who have read can tell what has been done in this discussion on either side. We might go into the question of the "inference," Br. G. *supposes* to be "involved" in certain texts, and deny it. But this, as we said, is but to travel the ground over again. We have shown that "dry bones" have *heard* "the word of the Lord," and were *not* "alive"; Ezk. 37. We have shown the *probability* that Acts 17; 31, has reference to Christ's "*ruling* the world," and not to judging it in Br. G.'s sense of the term. We have shown that if the phrase "every man," Rom. 2 : 6, embraces the whole of Adam's posterity—living and dead—that, by the same rule, the apostles must *hereafter* preach the gospel to all that posterity who have not heard it; because Christ commanded *them* to "preach the Gospel to *every creature*": Mark. 16 : 15. We have shown that "the tribulation and anguish," which "*the law*" threatened *did* "come upon the Jew *first*," just as Rom. 2d saith it should; and that "*all* things written," of "wrath," were "fulfilled" in "these days of vengeance"; as Jesus saith Luke 21 : 20–24; and as Paul said, "wrath is come upon them" [the Jews] "to the *uttermost*": 1 Thes. 2 : 16. We have shown that the "few and many stripes" are probably visited on the class of men spoken of in *this life*; and that there is no evidence that it relates to any other men than the *professed* "servants" of the Lord. And now, we are of *opinion*, it is superfluous for *us* to travel over the same ground again, at present; or till our readers have had time for reflection and personal searching the scriptures.

We "submit" that the phrase "of the Jew *first*," Rom. 2d, is, seemingly, irreconcilable with Br. G.'s idea that the "tribulation" comes upon them at the *same time* it does on Gentile sinners; and that his idea of a "*general* judgment," of the race of Adam, at one and the same time, made *alive*, seems totally at variance with many passages of scripture, and with Rom. 2d, as we have shown. The phrase "*general* judgment" no where occurs in the Bible; and in the *sense* usually employed, we "*submit*," that it has insurmountable obstacles to its reception; at least, it has in our mind. And once more, we "*submit*," that if all the wicked dead are to be made *alive* again, it is one of the most singular and strange things about *revelation* that such a doctrine must be *inferred*, and not have *one solitary* text, in all the *Book*, that

plainly affirms it, as Br. G. now admits by giving up 1 Corth. 15 ; 22. Are we to suppose that such a doctrine, if true, is to be left to *inference?*

As to any parallel between the Lord's "bruising His Son" and raising dead sinners to life to *torment* them we see none. In the one case the scriptures *affirm*, "it pleased the Lord to bruise" His Son ; first, that as the Captain of our Salvation he might be made "*perfect*" through suffering, Heb. 5 : 7–9 ; and that God might, by the work and sufferings of His Son, bless dying men by giving them *life*. An object worthy of God and bringing "glory to God and the Lamb." But the making alive dead sinners to *torture* them, with no design to benefit them, or any other part of the human family, does not appear to be an object worthy of God, and does not *seem* likely to bring glory to God or the Lamb. There is therefore, we "*submit*," no ground for comparison between the sufferings of Christ and making alive to torment and kill sinners after they have met the appointment "*once to die*": Heb. 9 : 27 ; and in their death, we have shown, that God has said, He has "*no pleasure, at all*": and hence cannot be supposed to repeat that death for the sake of multiplying tortures and "tribulation" : and we cannot "acknowledge" any conviction either of the utility or probability of such an event ; or that it will occur, unless we shall see more explicit evidence, than we have yet seen, that God *has* "*pleasure*" in such an exhibition of unmitigated torture and woe.

While our mind seems to be *forced* to a different conclusion from Br. GREW's, we rejoice to know that he is just as sincere and filled with the spirit of love as we claim to be ; and our love for him is uninterrupted, as we believe his also is for us. We sincerely pray that this investigation may, to the end, be kept clear of any spirit opposed to the spirit of Christ and love. If we have all knowledge and have not love we are nothing. So Paul speaks 1 Corth. 13. May we all be able to exhibit it in our lives ; and manifest that the honor of God and His Son is above all personal considerations.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive?

Among several excellent brethren who have written us on the above inquiry are two in different parts of the country, who have presented 1 Corth. 15 : 21—23 as *positive* proof of the *affirmative*. We deferred giving their arguments on that scripture till we could know if Br. GREW intended to use it, as we did not wish to have him forestalled if he chose to bring it forward. In our late visit to Philadelphia, his residence, we asked Br. GREW if he intended to use the text—"As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive?" He replied, unhesitatingly—"I cannot *conscientiously ;* for the resurrection of the *righteous only* is there spoken of ;" and now he has expressed himself on that text in this number of the EXAMINER.

After this frank response from Br. GREW we feel at liberty, and are glad to give the argument of the two brethren spoken of. Their arguments are substantially the same ; but we will give both in their own words, on 1 Corth. 15 : 21–23. We omit the names of these brethren, for the present, giving only their initials : but they are both men worthy of all respect. Their names shall be given if they desire it, hereafter. The first of the following, numbered *one*, is by "C. W. L." The next, numbered *two*, is by "H. H. H." We give them in this order for convenience of reference.

No. I.

Br. Storrs.—There seems to be considerable said of late in the BIBLE EXAMINER on the resurrection and non-resurrection of the wicked. I admire the spirit in which each opposing brother writes. They seem to write in *love* and forbearance ; and with a desire to know and defend the truth. To such I would say, in the spirit of my Master, "Do not err, my beloved brethren." I believe your heart is right, my beloved brother, who oppose the resurrection of the wicked dead ; but I think you are wrong in judgment.

The question is asked—"Is there *positive* testimony that the wicked dead will be made alive?" I answer *yes*. 1st Cor. 15 : 21–23 : "For since by man came death," (to all.) "by man came also the resurrection of" (all) "the dead. For as in Adam *all*" (good and bad) "die, even *so* in Christ *shall* ALL" (good and bad) "be made alive ; but every man in his own order," &c. ; (or in his own company.) I regard this text as "positive testimony" that the wicked dead will be made alive again, by a resurrection from the dead, *in* Christ, or *through* Christ, or *by* Christ ; and I do not see how any one can possibly set it aside. The simple facts in the case are these : If *all* are *not* made alive in or by Christ, then it follows, as a matter of course, that *all* did *not* die in Adam. Now I apprehend no one will deny the fact that all die in Adam. Why then deny that all will be made alive in Christ? I will here venture an assertion, and that is this : If the wicked dead *are not* made alive from that death which they have died in Adam, then it follows as a fact, which cannot be denied, that God is NOT the "Saviour of *all* men," and Christ also is *not* the Saviour of the world, nor "the Lamb of God that taketh away the *sin* of the world." Now in order to suit the theory of no resurrection of the wicked dead, the text in first Cor. 15, &c., should read thus : "For as in Adam all—mankind—die, even so in Christ

shall all—the righteous—be made alive; but every—righteous—man in his own order, or company."

No. II.

"You know, Br. STORRS, how difficult it is to get Christians to examine the unpopular doctrine of annihilation, disconnected from any thing else that would prejudice the mind. How much more difficult, then, will it be, if it is understood that we hold, and especially that *you* hold and advocate the non-resurrection of the wicked. I tremble at what I think may be the results of this controversy in prejudicing the mind against the glorious doctrine of immortality through Jesus Christ alone. Perhaps I am more fearful for the results than I would be if I could believe the *doctrine;* and yet if I did believe it, it would not alter the facts in the case; for this doctrine must necessarily add much to the prejudices of those who do or do not investigate the subject of life and death. I know there are many very plausible arguments in favor of the view, and some passages of Scripture appear plainer, and have more force with this view; but after all that has been said and written, I firmly believe that the great preponderance of testimony and argument is decidedly in favor of the resurrection of all men. The apostle hath said—"For as in Adam ALL die," [both the righteous and the wicked,] "even so in Christ shall ALL" [righteous and wicked] "be made *alive.* But every man" [shall be made alive] "in" [or with] "his own order:" [here then is the order of the resurrection:] "Christ, the first fruits," [was raised first] "afterward they that are Christ's" [all true Christians] "at his coming." This constitutes the first resurrection; "for the dead in Christ shall rise *first:*" "and blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first* resurrection—in such the *second death* hath no power." 'Then cometh the end," &c., when the wicked will be raised, or made alive under their own banner. To understand this Scripture differently is, it seems to me, to do violence to the language. This passage then, to say nothing about John 5 : 28, 29, furnishes, in my estimation, positive proof of the resurrection of all men; but add to this John 5 : 28, 29, and the many other passages of like import, and I cannot see how any man can, with such positive testimony, believe in the non-resurrection of the wicked. But I did not intend to argue the question, nor indeed to say half what I have, when I commenced."

It will be seen, as we said, that these brethren take the same view of 1 Corth. 15 : 22; and if their view is the *true one* it settles the question: but from their view Br. GREW dissents. In this "dissent" Respondent agrees; and Br. G. and ourself are united in the belief that Paul, in that discourse, saith not one word of the resurrection of the wicked dead: to suppose he does is to suppose he was a teacher of *universal salvation*, as it seems to us. Paul does teach that "*the dead,*" of whose resurrection he speaks in this chapter, are "raised in *incorruption,*" and "in glory:"—that "*the dead*" spoken of, "*shall be raised incorruptible,*" and "shall put on *immortality:*" verses 42, 43, 52, 54. If then we admit verse 22 is proof "*positive*" of the resurrection of the *wicked dead,* the verses we have spoken of are equally "*positive* proof" of their rising in *glory, incorruptibility,* and *immortality;* and such is precisely the argument of Universalists.

Whether the wicked dead are made alive again or not, we have, for years, been settled in the belief that Paul was speaking *only* of the resurrection of those *in* Christ throughout 1 Corth. 15. If the wicked dead are referred to in that chapter, it is our opinion, it is in the 18th verse. We are not prepared to express a positive opinion on the term "*also*" in that verse. He based the doctrine of the resurrection on the fact that *Christ* rose from the dead, and thus makes the resurrection one of the *benefits* or *blessings* of Christ's death and resurrection. To the wicked dead, we presume, our brethren will not contend being made *alive* again is a *benefit* or *blessing.*

The apostle establishes first, *the fact* of Christ's resurrection by the testimony of witnesses who saw him *after* that event. He then asks—"How say some among you that there is *no* resurrection of *the dead?*" He affirms, "If there be *no* resurrection of *the dead,* then is Christ not risen."—From this point he proceeds to enforce the fact of Christ's resurrection, and to show the consequences of the contrary supposition, and says—"Then they *also* which are fallen asleep *in* Christ are *perished.*" The word "*also,*" in this verse, distinguished those who had "fallen asleep *in* Christ" from somebody else. It refers either to Christ himself, or to those *not in* Christ, *viz:* the *wicked* dead. We incline to the *opinion,* it refers to the wicked dead. If so, it amounts to a clear declaration of the apostle that the wicked dead *have* "*perished;*" and "if Christ be not raised, then they *also* which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Such seems to be the sense of the apostle's language. It shows that he regarded those who had died *out* of Christ as *hopelessly dead:* dead past revival into *life,* in any event; and those asleep *in* Christ equally hopelessly dead, *i. e. perished,* if Christ be not raised. He immediately adds—"If in this life only *we* have *hope* in Christ, we are of *all men* most miserable:" verse 19. The "hope" is in the resurrection. Is that hope to be realized by those "*in* Christ," or are they "*also*" to perish as "*all*" those other "men" with whom the "*we*" are contrasted in verse 19? To settle this point Paul triumphantly adds—"But now *is* Christ risen

from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that *slept*." Who are "them that *slept*," of whom the apostle speaks? Clearly, to our mind, it is to them that "are fallen asleep *in* Christ:" v. 18.—Christ can by no means be said to be the "first-fruits" of the *wicked* dead: for the *first-fruits* must be in character and kind the same as the harvest, else it would not represent the harvest crop, which was the design of the first fruits. But Christ was neither in character nor kind the first-fruits of the wicked dead; and therefore his revival into life is *no pledge* of their revival: but "if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, *even so* them *also* that *sleep in* Jesus will God bring *with him:*" 1 Thess. 5 : 14. If Christ rose from the dead to life, "them also that sleep in him" are sure of a revival into life; and those who dispute *their* resurrection are ignorant of the fact of Christ's revival from the dead, and deny it. "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept; for since by man came death, by man also came the resurrection of *the dead.*" What "dead?" Surely "the dead *in* Christ," of which he "became the first-fruits."—"For as *in* Adam all die, *even so in* Christ shall all be made alive."

Let the question now be candidly looked at—What is the import of the words "*even so?*"—How came men to die? Was it not by being *in* Adam? or, in consequence of a *union* with him? Truly, say you. Very well: then does not "*even so*" import a *union* with Christ in order to being "made alive?" So it seems to us; and the entire argument of the apostle seems to shut us up to this conclusion. As though he had said—"I have taught you that the resurrection, or revival into life, of those who have fallen asleep *in* Christ, depends on the revival of Christ; and now I further tell you as truly, and *even so*, as all are mortal, and die by having been *in* Adam, so *in* Christ, or *all in* Christ, shall just as certainly be made alive: Adam was no more effectual to bring *death* and *corruption* on all those *in* him, than Christ is to bring *life* and *incorruptibility* to all those *in* him. The one Adam brought death to *all in* him: the other Adam, *even so*, brings life to *all in* him."

Such we regard as the true teaching of 1 Cor. 15 : 22; and the apostle carries on this contrast to the close of the chapter, as we will endeavor to show after noticing one quotation in "No. II" of the foregoing articles, *viz:* "The dead *in* Christ shall rise *first:*" 1 Thess. 4 : 16. Does the term "*first*" here have any reference to another class to be raised *afterwards?* We think not: and we are sure if the brother looks at the connection he will see that it refers to what the apostle had said in verse 15, *viz:* "*We* which are *alive* and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not *prevent*"—literally, *go before*—"them which are asleep:" he then adds—"*For* the Lord himself shall descend from heaven * * * and the dead *in* Christ shall rise *first:* THEN we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them,*" &c. The word *first* here is seen to have reference only to the fact that the living saints would not go to meet the Lord, on his return from heaven, till the dead in Christ were *first* raised, so that all should go "together." Here is no idea of a "*first resurrection:*" and Paul, we humbly believe, never speaks of *two* resurrections, except of "Christ the first-fruits: afterwards *they* that *are Christ's at his coming.*" "THEN cometh the *end:*" not, *then* cometh another resurrection. No, he speaks of no other resurrection of men except that which takes place "*at*" Christ's coming. The expression, "every man in his own *order;*" *cohort*, or *band*, we are of opinion, has reference only to the same thing he speaks of verse 41 and 42. "a difference" among "them that are Christ's," arising from the different capacities and circumstances in which they had lived and had their personal trial, under the various dispensations: or if we adhere to the most strict interpretation of the words, "every man in his own order," the apostle states what he means, *viz:* "Christ the *first-fruits*; afterwards they that are Christ's *at* his coming." Thus he speaks of only two seasons of resurrection: the first embraces Christ himself; and the next his people.

But we proceed with the apostle's argument on the resurrection, as more fully opened from verse 42—"So also in the resurrection of *the* dead.—*They* are sown in corruption, they arise *without* corruption: *they* are sown in dishonor, they arise *in glory:* they are sown in weakness, they arise in power: it is sown an animal body, it ariseth a spiritual body. For there is a body of the animal life, and there is a body of the spirit: so also it is written—'Adam, the first man, became a living soul:' the second Adam [became] a quickening spirit. And the spiritual was not first; but the *animal*, and then the spiritual. The first man was of the dust, from the earth; the second man was the Lord from heaven." Thus far we have followed Prof. MURDOCK'S translation from the Syriac. We now proceed with the common English version.

"As is the earthy such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly such are [*shall be*] they also that are heavenly. And as *we* have borne the image of the earthy, *we* shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

Thus the apostle carries out the idea that death and corruption came by the *animal* man, Adam the first; and that there is no life, or revival principle, *in* him: hence going down to the *earth* in him, no revival into life is to be looked for in their case. But such as "are *heavenly*" shall "bear the image of the heavenly"—be "raised in glory"—"in incorruption"—"put on immortality." Thus, the apostle affirms, "*the dead* shall be raised;" verses 42, 43, 52-54. And he gives us no account of any other revival into life except of the "heavenly," or those '*in* Christ:" *all* these will as certainly be "made alive" as all men came to die by a union with the earthy Adam.

It is at the "last trump" that those "*in* Christ" are "made alive." *Then* "death is swallowed up in victory:" verse 54. It is *then* "the last enemy shall be destroyed, death:" verse 26. Here is no teaching of the revival into life of the wicked dead in this chapter. It must be found somewhere else, if found at all, in our judgment. When it can be demonstrated that the wicked dead, who are *not in* Christ, shall be made *alive*, from 1 Corth. 15, we think universal salvation needs no other demonstration; and then our beloved brother, of "No. I," will "have the sin of the world" taken "away" in *reality:* and Christ will be "the Saviour of all men" in the Universalist sense. We understand Christ to be the Saviour of all men as an offered gift of God to all: and as the *only* Saviour any man can have; while he is *actually*, or "*specially* the Saviour" from sin and death, *only* "of those who believe;" and that Jesus "taketh away the *sin* of the world" only by a personal deliverance from sin, so far as individuals are concerned; and that he will destroy the devil, and his dominion over the world, by himself, in due time, taking possession of earth with his saints; thus restoring the world to order, by putting the devil and his children eternally under that death which sin introduced. To suppose any other taking away the sin of the world, or any other salvation of all men, seems to us, must lead to universal salvation from sin and death: or *Restorationism.* For such a view we find no authority in scripture: for "all the wicked will God destroy;" and "the soul that sinneth it *shall* die." Psa. 145: 20; Ezk. 18: 4, 20.

Our brethren will see that we have not given them an answer item by item; but have taken a *general* view of Paul's argument and conclusions in 1 Corth. 15. In conclusion, we may add that many eminent expositors of the Scriptures hold the view that Paul is speaking *only* of the resurrection of the righteous, in this chapter; and such was our settled view before we had a "*doubt*" of the revival of the wicked into life. Our view, therefore, on 1 Corth. 15: 22, is not the result of a doubt on the question under discussion with Br. GREW, but was previously formed: yet we confess, it was preaching on Paul's contrast of the first and second Adam, and the result to the *earthy* and the *heavenly* that first led us to doubt the revival, from death, of the wicked dead.—Every effort to use that chapter in support of such revival has only served to confirm us that no such doctrine is found there; but, on the contrary, it does seem to teach that none but such as "have fallen asleep *in* Christ" shall ever be revived into life.

These remarks are submitted to the reader with the most sincere respect and love for the dear brethren whose arguments have been the occasion of them. If they cannot see as we do on 1 Corth. 15, we shall love them none the less. We know they both have the cause of God and truth near their hearts.

They have each introduced some other texts which we have not inserted in their communications, simply because Br. GREW has previously used them, and our response would have compelled us to refer to our replies to him in last year's volume—which some of our present subscribers have not—or else we must travel over the same ground again, which we do not think best to do so soon. If, however, they wish, after Br. G. is through, to go over any part of the ground again they shall have place in our columns. They are at liberty to reply now to our remarks on 1 Corth. 15: 22, if either of them wish to do so.

BR. JACOB GRIM.—This brother was a resident of *Philadelphia.* The past year he has removed to *Plymouth,* about sixteen miles north of his former residence. At a meeting in a school house, near his present residence, some weeks since, a congregation were disappointed in their minister not coming on Sunday evening. Rather than have them go home without any instruction, Br. GRIM volunteered to give them a little. It seems the congregation were so well entertained they wished to hear him again. He had spoken to them two or three times prior to our visit to Phil-

adelphia, Dec. 23d. He came into the city to hear us in the day time, but returned home to speak to the people in the evening. The minister had given out word he should be there to oppose him. The following note from him gives an account of that evening and subsequent movements:

"I had quite a congregation the evening you were in the city. The school house was full: more outside than in. I suppose there were three hundred persons inside and out. I spoke on Man's Creation, and gave an opportunity to any person to reply; but their gun, that raised the crowd, was not there. I spoke again the next Sunday evening, on Man's Fall and Redemption, and gave the same opportunity to reply; but no opposition. The only opposition I have met with is the cry of "*Infidel*," and the "Board of Managers" calling a meeting to shut the school house against me. But there was a majority of *one* in favor of my speaking. I have another hall offered, rent free, warmed and lighted, as soon as they close the school house. Next Sunday evening I am to speak in Penn Square—a village about two miles above here—in a hall that will seat two hundred. One of the School Directors says it will not do for me to cross the old beaten tracks of the people in the neighborhood. I showed up the church and clergy two weeks ago, and some of the good members do not like to hear it. I never have had more attentive audiences than I have here. I shall speak as long as a door is open, and the people are willing to hear; and if the clergy don't like it, all they have to do is to come and show me that I am in error."

From Wm. Ridgeway, Paterson.

Dear Brother,—In reading the last number of the EXAMINER I was much pleased with your remarks on "An Old Heathen." If you were disposed to illustrate your subjects in the manner of some of our popular publications, I might recommend you to have a plate in front of your remarks representing PLATO leading SCHLEIERMACHER to the cross of Christ, while John the Baptist and the Beloved Disciple were standing in the background. Br. Stevens is a bold man: it is not every preacher that would dare to represent the influence of Plato as superior to the Popes, Bishops, and divinely-called preachers of Orthodoxy. But the truth will out, and must finally prevail. Here we have one of the most popular writers in the church representing what he calls a great change in the theological mind of Germany, as having been started, in the first place, by the influence of Plato on Schleiermacher; who, it would seem, was not in the mood to receive the purer spiritualism of Christianity until he became a Platonist in philosophy. "Plato," Br. Stevens says, "has always had a similar influence in the church." There is no doubt that Plato has always had too much influence in the church. To the influence of heathenism we owe the unchristian theory of immortal soulism, which lies at the root of most of the errors of Orthodoxy: and until Jesus, Paul, and John take the place of Plato those errors will continue in the church.

The letter of A. G. MERWIN gave me great pleasure. I like its tone. It has the ring of the true metal in it. With him, "I see no half-way ground between free discussion and exclusive sectarianism." Although I am not convinced that the wicked will not rise again, yet I have read the controversy with great interest, and have been particularly pleased with the manly and christian spirit in which it has been thus far conducted. It is too often the case that parties engaged in religious controversy are more eager to hold up themselves and put down their opponent than to hold up truth and put down error. We want the *subject* dissected—not the person. "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good," ought to be our motto. Had the Editor of the *National Magazine* observed this advice he would not have published in that excellent paper the silly poem called "*Babie Bell:*" a poem as false in sentiment as it is silly in expression. I give you a few lines as a specimen:

"Have you not heard the Poet tell
How came the dainty Baby Bell
Into this world of ours?
The gates of Heaven were left ajar!
With folded hands and dreamy eyes
She wandered out of Paradise!
She saw this planet, like a star,
Hang in the depths of purple even—
Its bridges, running to and fro,
O'er which the white-winged seraphs go,
Bearing the holy dead to Heaven!
She touched a bridge of flowers—those feet,
So light, they did not b nd the bells
Of the Celestial Asphodels!
They fell like dew upon the flowers!
And all the air grew strangely sweet!
And thus came dainty Baby Bell
Into this world of ours."

The above lines form only a part of the poem. And now what think you of such teaching from a preacher of the gospel? Here the idea is held out to the young mind that souls live before they come into this world. Let us strip the foregoing lines of their poetic garb and dress the ideas in plain prose, and they will read something like the following: "Once upon a time there was a little girl named Baby Bell; and before she came here she lived in Paradise. One day, it seems, she was wandering about, with her hands folded and her eyes half shut, between dreaming and waking, when she came to the gates of Heaven—for Heaven and Paradise you know are the same—and, as it happened, the gates were ajar, and she peeped out and saw this world of ours, like a star, a great way off. It seems that she took a notion to go there; and, looking about, she saw a great many bridges

running from there to th
bridges she saw hosts of w
rying the good people,
Heaven. It does not app
any notice of Baby Bell,
herself—it appearing to h
come down from Heaver
She found a bridge of flo
as lightly as the dew, not
cate bell flowers in her w
world of ours. It seems
however, in wishing to c
after living a few years, s
had to carry her back ag
It seems that the pre
not so careful what they
Wesley's days.
Wishing you success i
remain, truly yours.

From Elder J.

Br. Storrs.—To encou
making sacrifices to spre
EXAMINER, a few extract
which I am receiving.
courage the circulation
and death question.

Chelse
Dear Sir.—In the mo
business trip "out West,
steamer on Lake Erie I s
be published by you, titl
purchased the work, an
wanted other copies, but
find any one that has it f
inform me what a few co
be delivered to me for?
ber of a Baptist Churc
continue I cannot say, a
doctrines found in your
has been dimly held by
knew not what it was.
"endless punishment."
you do in your work—th
finity between man and
am now giving my atte
science of geology. But
your work to distribute a

The following is from

"*Bro. Blain*.—Fortun
riding in the cars one
name of HUDSON, a
handed me your book,
bought it. Now I wish
your books, and other go
and shall send for the Br
your book. I want all t
on the subject—am alone
I know. I am a local Me
intend, when I know en
self, to preach the truth
fully satisfied the Bible t
the wicked, and not eterna

running from there to this earth: and on these bridges she saw hosts of white-winged angels carrying the good people, who had died here, to Heaven. It does not appear that the angels took any notice of Baby Bell, but let her find her way herself—it appearing to have been much easier to come down from Heaven than to go up there.—She found a bridge of flowers, and tripped along as lightly as the dew, not even bending the delicate bell flowers in her way, until she got to this world of ours. It seems she made a sad mistake however, in wishing to come to this world; for, after living a few years, she died, and the angels had to carry her back again."

It seems that the preachers of the gospel are not so careful what they teach as they were in Wesley's days.

Wishing you success in defending the truth, I remain, truly yours.

From Elder J. Blain, Buffalo.

Br. Storrs.—To encourage brethren who are making sacrifices to spread truth, I send, for the EXAMINER, a few extracts of letters, out of many which I am receiving. I do it especially to encourage the circulation of our works on the life and death question.

Chelsea, Mass, Dec. 22d, '55.

Dear Sir.—In the month of October I took a business trip "out West," and while on board a steamer on Lake Erie I saw a book purporting to be published by you, titled, "Death not Life." I purchased the work, and since my return have wanted other copies, but have not been able to find any one that has it for sale. Will you please inform me what a few copies—say 30 to 50—can be delivered to me for? I am at present a member of a Baptist Church; but how long I shall continue I cannot say, as I am propagating the doctrines found in your work—a doctrine which has been dimly held by me for some years, but knew not what it was. I never could believe in "endless punishment." I go a little farther than you do in your work—that is, in regard to the affinity between man and the brute creation—and am now giving my attention very closely to the science of geology. But I want several copies of your work to distribute among my friends. E. J.

The following is from Pickaway Co., Ohio:

"*Bro. Blain.*—Fortunately for me, as I was riding in the cars one day, a passenger by the name of HUDSON, a Congregational minister, handed me your book, (Death not Life,) and I bought it. Now I wish you to send me some of your books, and other good works on the subject, and shall send for the BIBLE EXAMINER named in your book. I want all the information I can get on the subject—am alone in this county as far as I know. I am a local Methodist E. Preacher, and intend, when I know enough how to defend myself, to preach the truth to the people, for I am fully satisfied the Bible teaches the destruction of the wicked, and not eternal torment." T. F. H.

From Asbury University, in Greencastle, Ind., a friend writes:

"*Mr. Blain.*—There is now a great demand here for your work, Death not Life; and if you will send two dozen I will forward the pay," &c.

On sending the money, he says:

"We have organized an Investigation Society, composed of students and others who are not bound down by the theories of the schoolmen; and among other matters the doctrine of destruction came up, and soon found a vigorous defence. I shall sell the books you sent, and may want another lot for the Berean Bible Class, of which I have spoken, and others who are now interested in the contest." T. S.

Another from Newark, Ohio, says:

"*Mr. Blain.*—Please send me 'Death not Life,' with other works you may have, that will assist a Bible scholar in searching for the truths of the Bible. Let me know the prices, and I will send pay," &c. J. W. B.

A Presbyterian minister of Washington County, N. Y., who is at present only preaching as a supply to churches of that order, wrote me in Oct.:

"I enclose $1, for which I will thank you to send me some of 'Death not Life' for distribution. I have read your book with much pleasure, and hope it may be the means of removing prejudice, and causing a careful and prayerful study of God's word, on these all-important subjects." J. P.

The above are some of the proofs that "we labor not in vain." The Lord give us more courage and zeal in our sweet work of reform! I propose to remain at home till February.

From Dr. B. B. Schenck, Plainville.

Br. Storrs.—While waiting to write to you, I have thought of many, many things that I would like to say, if they could but appear in a well-expressed form. Among the things that I want to say are, that I value the EXAMINER above all price for the excellent selection of truth it contains. I like your "*farewell*" answer to your withdrawn (lady) patron. I like the discussion between Br. "GREW and RESPONDENT:" and, to sum up with, I like it all. I must give my verdict in favor of Respondent in that discussion. My opinion of the resurrection of the wicked, for two years past, has been on the side of Respondent.

SEBASTOPOL AND THE VIRGIN MARY.—The Romish priests in France are endeavoring to persuade the people that they are indebted to the Virgin Mary for the capture of Sebastopol. They allege, in support of this statement, that the great fortress fell on the 8th of September, the day, we believe, assigned as the date of the Virgin's annunciation. It is remarkable that Gen. Pelissier is a French Protestant.—*Londonderry Standard.*

PREMIUMS.

We have concluded to give to any person sending us $2, at one time, for the 24 numbers of the EXAMINER for this year, either of the following works, as they shall choose, which we will send, free of postage, on the receipt of their money.

1. BIBLE EXAMINER, in sheets for 1855 from number 4, *viz*: 21 numbers, till the edition is exhausted.

2. *One* bound DISCUSSION, with Prof. Mattison; or *two* in paper covers, as they choose.

3. DOBNEY ABRIDGED—in paper cover—being Part II of H. H. Dobney's work on Future Punishment, containing *all* he has said on the final end of the wicked.

4. BIBLE VS. TRADITION, in *paper covers*.

Either of the foregoing works will be sent, till further notice, as above stated. Let the subscriber name definitely which he will have, else we shall send none.

The following are the general *Terms* of the BIBLE EXAMINER, with payment *always in advance*.

To Single Subscribers—for 24 numbers,	-	$2.00
" *Clubs*, for three copies,	- - -	5.00
" Five "	- - -	8.00
" Ten "	- - -	15.00
" Twenty "	- - -	25.00
" Thirty "	- - -	30.00

Money for the EXAMINER may be sent at *our risk*, provided the following things are attended to. *First:* Seal your letter with a *wafer* firmly, and not trust to "*self*-sealing" envelopes. *Second:* Keep a record of the *time* you mail it, but do *not* get the letter "*registered*." *Third:* Be sure to direct it—"GEO. STORRS, *Editor Bible Examiner, New York*."

"ANALYTICAL INVESTIGATION Concerning the Credibility of the Scriptures, and of the Religious Systems inculcated in them: together with an Historical Exhibition of Human Conduct during the several dispensations under which mankind have been placed by the Creator. *By J. H. M'Culloh*, M. D., 2 vols. 8vo., [of over 500 pages each.] *Baltimore*, 1852." Sold at the low sum of $2.

It is a great and invaluable *help* in the Study of the Scriptures and in the defence of the same. Postage on the two volumes 54 cents. For $2,50 we will send the work free to the purchaser. We have just received a new supply of it.

BOOKS.—We have received of SHELDON, LAMPORT & Co., 115 Nassau street, New York, several new works. We can do little more now than give their titles. These works are all published by JOHN P. JEWETT & *Company*, Boston: JEWETT, PROCTOR & WORTHINGTON, *Cleveland*, Ohio: SHELDON, LAMPORT & BLAKEMAN, of this city.

1. "THE COMMUNION SABBATH: *By* NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D., Pastor of Essex Street Church, Boston."

A neatly executed volume of 208 pages, on most interesting topics. Price $1.

2. "THE BIBLE HISTORY OF PRAYER: *With Practical Reflections. By* CHARLES A. GOODRICH."

This is a well arranged work of 384 pages. Judging from a glance at its contents, we think it must be a very instructive and useful volume. Price $1.

3. "SABBATH TALKS, *with the Little Children, about* JESUS: By the Author of 'The Mothers of the Bible.'"

This is a beautiful little volume of some 140 pages: for the most part well calculated, we should think, to engage the attention of those for whom it was written. Price 38 cents.

4. "GLANCES AND GLIMPSES; *or Fifty Years Social*, including *Twenty Years Professional Life*: By HARRIOT K. HUNT, M. D."

A volume of over 400 pages. Of its merits we are not prepared to speak, for lack of time to examine it. Price $1.

THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT: By H. H. DOBNEY, Baptist Minister, England. This work was published in this country several years since "*By an Association of Gentlemen*;" but for some time past there has been none for sale. Br. H. L. HASTINGS, Peace Dale, R. I., has recently issued an edition of it, *entire*, with an *Appendix* of 24 pages containing JOHN MILTON'S views of "*The State of the Dead*," extracted from his "*Treatise on Christian Doctrine*;" the whole making a neat volume of over 300 pages, bound. Price 75 cents, sent free of postage. It can be had of Br. HASTINGS, as above. We will obtain it for any who desire us to do so.

ERRATA.—In my piece headed "What Next?"—in Examiner for Jan. 1st—for "reviving" in 7th line read "*revizing*;" and for "*the*" in 10th line read "*that*." Without the *former* of these corrections Prof. M.'s meaning is exactly reversed.

R. WENDELL.

☞ Love is happiness: he who grows in love, grows therefore in happiness. God is love; and love is his image within us. If I would resemble him let me strengthen love, never allowing a degrading selfishness to reign in my heart.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, FEBRUARY 1, 1856. NO. 3.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY
At No. 141 Fulton-street.
TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:
Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Annihilation. Rev. Mr. Thompson.

THE following report of this gentleman's late sermon in "*Broadway Tabernacle*," of this city, has been furnished us by Rev. J. HURLEY, late *Editor* of the "*Irish Evangelist*."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER:—*Dear Sir.*—Having read many copies of your in valuable paper with interest and profit, I have often felt inclined to write you a few lines declaring my sympathy with the *general principles*, for the advocacy of which you *are* a proscribed character among the bulk of professing Christians—especially those who are regarded as the preachers of the Gospel; but, seeing you have numerous correspondents whose writings will doubtless contribute more to advance our *common cause* than mine, I have always resisted these inclinations, knowing that any vacancy in your limited space could be more profitably filled by your own thoughts.

But I cannot resist the temptation of telling you something about a lecture on *Annihilation* which I heard delivered by *Rev.* J. P. THOMPSON in the Broadway Tabernacle, (December 30th. 1855.) Not that there was anything in the lecture, considered in itself, worthy of special notice, for, in my opinion, and in the opinion of others also who heard it, it was, in regard to matter, arrangement, argumentation and logical accuracy, a total failure—just what the Scotch lawyer said of the blasphemy against God, a thing that could do "*neither gid nor harm.*"

What is notice worthy and interesting in the connection is, that Mr. T., and very many of his Theological School, begin to feel that their "craft" of natural immortality and eternal conscious misery of the wicked, is fast falling into disrepute amongst the serious and intelligent masses of our community, and, if they cannot patch it up cleverly, is likely soon to slide into such an abyss as Mr. THOMPSON described hell to be—"*A deep, dark pit, having neither bottom nor shore.*" On this boundless and profound depth, Mr. T. said, "*the lost spirits*" would be cast; where, as a matter of course, they must eternally keep sinking deeper and deeper, unless the king of said regions will provide them with *immaterial wings*, which, however, can avail them nothing, *as* they can never meet any shore whereupon they may rest their *immaterial feet.*(!)

That the BIBLE EXAMINER mainly contributes to set the thoughtful a thinking on these subjects I have not the least doubt, and on that account it struck me that this item of news might interest your readers.

The question proposed in the public notice given in the *Daily Times* of Saturday, was as follows:—"*Do the Scriptures teach the Annihilation of the Wicked?*" Having given out a hymn, Mr. T. read a portion of the 25th chapter of Matthew's Gospel, beginning at vs. 31, to the end of the chapter, and took for his text the first clause of vs. 41, and the whole of vs. 46, and made them read as follows:—"*Depart from me, ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels. * * * And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.*"

He commenced his lecture by stating that he had thoroughly investigated this subject by reading the works of those men who wrote in support of the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked, and referring to the passages of Scripture they quoted as proof for their position, but none of them had thus far convinced him. He next attempted, but with ill success, to show that both the love of God, and the justice of his law required that the wicked must suffer *eternal conscious misery.* After which he proposed to show what the Holy Scriptures taught respecting the condition of the wicked after the judgment. To do this, he said it was necessary for him to state the principles of interpretation by which he must be governed.

He went on to say that, in reference to the punishment of the wicked, the language of the New-Testament is highly figurative. When it speaks of *fire* it does not mean literal or material fire, but a punishment equivalent to the pain material fire would cause. No figurative passage, because it suited the peculiar opinions of any man, is to be read as though it were literal, or all figurative, as that would make a contradiction; but all the figurative expressions must be made to harmonize by clustering them around in support of some literal fact which underlay them all, and to give strength to which they were used. The text, he said, was such as could not be constructed into a figure; it was the positive declaration of a fact which underlay, and must give meaning to all the figurative expressions in the Bible.

He then proceeded with the most silly illustra

tions imaginable, by supposing a man to be sentenced at one of our criminal courts, and some one would ask Mr. T., on his return from the court, what the nature of his sentence and punishment was, and Mr. T. would answer, "*Well he is done for—he is in fire—is on a rack—he is in utter darkness—his light is put out—etc.*" And, as the explanation of the whole, he would finally say, "*the man is sentenced to solitary confinement for life.*"

Thus, you see, Mr. T. was making figures and dealing out punishment according to the vanity of his own imagination; and, forsooth, all this was explaining the Bible, and the nature of the punishment which it utters against the wicked.

He next proceeded to, as he said, explain the meaning of the word punishment, as used in the text. Said it occurred only four times in the New-Testament. First, in the text. Secondly, Acts 4: 21. Thirdly, 2 Peter 2: 9. Fourth, and lastly, 1 John 4 : 18. The Greek word *Kolasin*. which was rendered punishment in the text, was, in John 4: 18 rendered torment: "*for fear hath torment.*" Therefore, in Mr. T's. opinion, the meaning of everlasting punishment must be everlasting torment. Sound logic, brother Thompson.(!)

Thus, you see, he had the Scriptures "*harmonised*" and explained in a nut-shell. And, doubtless, it so appeared to many of his hearers. But bro. T. was not without his own doubts as to the soundness of his conclusions; so to make a deeper impression on his audience, he wandered from his proposition—left the Bible, and went off to the heathen, showing, in eloquent strains and glowing words, what *Plato* said was the meaning of *Kolasin.*

Leaving the classics, he next dived into the *Apocrypha*, and told us what *Wisdom* and *Maccabees* said it meant. And finally to end further controversy on the subject, he told us that *Josephus* also said "*Kolasin*" meant torment—and, as in the text, the *Kolasin* of the wicked had the same word to denote its duration that the *zoen*, or life of the righteous had: therefore Mr. T. concluded in the most profound manner, that when the misery of the wicked had an end, the life of the righteous, and heaven itself, must have an end, also. In conclusion, having, as he supposed, done up the business, he told his hearers that none but bad people believed in the annihilation of the wicked. Those who were living bad lives, desired in vain to be annihilated; and closed up by exhorting them to believe all he said as gospel, if they wished to avoid eternal torments!

Now to undertake a refutation of Mr. Thompson's lecture would be a work of pure *supererogation*, as his argument proved nothing, and therefore, refutes itself. But by showing the simple meaning of the texts he quoted in favor of *eternal conscious torment*, all that he said, so far as it is worth anything, goes to strengthen the scriptural truth, that the wicked shall be utterly *destroyed*, and "that they *shall perish.*"

In reference to the text in 1 John 4; 18, it is but the illustration of a fact which is as common as it is true, that we do not fear a man whom we love and know that he loves us. The whole strain of the epistle is that if God so manifested his love to us that he gave his Son to die for us, we ought also to love God in return—and not only ought we to love God, but as God loved us all, we ought also, in obedience to his command, to love one another. "*God is love,*" said John, "*and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God. Herein is our love made perfect,*"—or carried to such perfection "*that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: for as he is*" benevolent, "*so are we*" benevolent "*in this world.*" *There is no fear* of the judgment in those that *love* God and man: *but perfect love* to God and man *casteth out* of man the *fear* of the judgment: *because* such *fear causeth torment.* *He, therefore, that feareth* the judgment *is not made perfect in love* to God and *man.* See 1 John 4: 16, 17, 18. This text teaches nothing as to the condition of the wicked after the judgment, as Mr. T. thinks. It speaks simply of the torment of fear, and the fear is a dread of the judgment.

As regards the text in 2 Peter 2 : 9, it is really strange that Mr. T's. blindness should be so great as not to see that by quoting it in support of *eternal conscious misery*, he was bringing destruction into his own camp. The apostle is showing that, as there were false prophets among the Jews, so there shall be false teachers among the Christians; who, for the love of money, shall make merchandize of the people, by teaching them falsehoods for the truth of God; and that their conduct should give rise to scoffers who will deny the truth of revelation altogether. He then goes on to show that their punishment is certain, from the fact that God spared not the angels who sinned, but put them in durance, reserved under darkness, unto the judgment day. Then as an example of the punishment that is to be inflicted on the wicked, he refers to the antediluvians, who were all destroyed by the flood, and to the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, who were destroyed by fire. And from the preservation of *Noah* and *Lot*, with their families, he shows that God is able and willing to preserve the godly, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished. Peter tells us that in the days of Noah's flood, there were but "*eight souls saved by water;*" *all* the rest perished in the flood: 1 Peter 3: 20.

In reference to the text in Acts 4: 21, that the punishment of death was what the rulers of the Jewish natior desired to inflict upon the disciples is more than probable: and Mr. T. made a mistake by saying the *Sanhedrim* had not the power of inflicting death. That was the only body that could sentence a man to be stoned to death; but they feared to punish the apostles thus, as all the people glorified God for the miracle they had wrought.

Mr. Thompson made another mistake by saying the word punishment is mentioned only four times in the New-Testament. It is mentioned five times. Paul is showing the Jews that "*He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses;*" he then asks them "*Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, &c.*" The idea put forth

here would seem to be so
man who violated the law
put to death without mer
mercy is the man worthy
which the Son of God has
Perhaps it was easier for
text than to reconcile its
his idea of *eternal conscio*

Lastly, in reference to th
Mr. Thompson, doubtless,
to offer any explanation o
cate the difficulty of his po
of it. Enough for him tha
ted *torment* in 1 John 4
Wisdom, Judas Macabee
meant torment; and as Jo
judgment hath *torment*, th
ment must be *eternal torm*

Now the language of the
ment to the wicked and e
eous. Thus is the promise
contrast. The words and
punishment of the wicked
endless as the blessing of th
as the blessing conferred
eternal, and this is placed
ishment of the wicked, th
of the wicked must be *ete*

Death is the opposite, an
to life; and as *eternal dea*
contrast to *eternal life*, the
interpret the eternal punish
to eternal life—*eternal deat*
and punishments promised
are everlasting punishmen
everlasting life to the righ
like to know if the wicked ha
how can their punishment
of the life eternal of the rig
possessing conscious existe
session of *life* as the most f
universe can possibly be.
life eternal to the righteous
no meaning if the wicked we
for *a miserable life eternal*
nal, as a happy life eternal
qualifications—does not m
righteous, nor the punishme
only places the one in opposi
as death is the opposite to li
to the righteous establishes
to the wicked. If there was
all the Bible threatening the
struction, perdition, this tex
lish the question in the mind
No one can understand life
life.

The Love of

Could I with ink the oce
Was this whole earth a
Was every single stick a
And every man a scribe
To write the love of God
Would drain the ocean d
Nor would the scroll con
Though stretched from sk

here would seem to be something like this. The man who violated the law that Moses made, was put to death without mercy. Of how much less mercy is the man worthy, who violates the law which the Son of God has made? Heb. 10 : 29. Perhaps it was easier for Mr. T. to slip over this text than to reconcile its mode of punishment with his idea of *eternal conscious misery*.

Lastly, in reference to the text in Matt. 25 : 46, Mr. Thompson, doubtless, feeling conscious that to offer any explanation of it would only complicate the difficulty of his position, wisely kept clear of it. Enough for him that *Kolasin* was translated *torment* in 1 John 4 : 18; and that *Plato*, *Wisdom*, *Judas Macabees*, and *Josephus* said it meant torment; and as John said the fear of the judgment hath *torment*, therefore *eternal punishment* must be *eternal torment!*

Now the language of the text is endless punishment to the wicked and endless life to the righteous. Thus is the promise to each placed in plain contrast. The words and meaning is, that the punishment of the wicked, as to duration, is as endless as the blessing of the righteous; forasmuch as the blessing conferred on the righteous is *life eternal*, and this is placed in contrast to the punishment of the wicked, therefore the punishment of the wicked must be *eternal death*.

Death is the opposite, and only natural contrast to life; and as *eternal death* is the only natural contrast to *eternal life*, therefore we are obliged to interpret the eternal punishment, placed in contrast to eternal life—*eternal death*. Indeed the rewards and punishments promised all through the gospels, are everlasting punishment to the wicked, and everlasting life to the righteous. Now I would like to know if the wicked have existence anywhere how can their punishment be made the antithesis of the life eternal of the righteous: for any being possessing conscious existence, is as truly in possession of *life* as the most favored creature in the universe can possibly be. Hence the promise of life eternal to the righteous as a boon, could have no meaning if the wicked were not deprived of life; for *a miserable life eternal* is as truly *a life eternal, as a happy life eternal*. The text makes no qualifications—does not modify the life of the righteous, nor the punishment of the wicked; but only places the one in opposition to the other; and as death is the opposite to life, the promise of life to the righteous establishes the certainty of death to the wicked. If there was not another text in all the Bible threatening the wicked with *death, destruction, perdition*, this text alone should establish the question in the mind of every candid man. *No one can understand life to be the opposite of life.*

J. H.

The Love of God.

Could I with ink the ocean fill;
Was this whole earth a parchment made—
Was every single stick a quill,
And every man a scribe by trade—
To write the love of God alone,
Would drain the ocean dry;—
Nor would the scroll contain the whole,
Though stretched from sky to sky.

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

[From "Credibility of the Scriptures."]

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

BY J. H. M'CULLOH, M. D., BALTIMORE.

(Continued from vol, 10, p. 372.)

HAVING stated my own views concerning the original constitution of christian churches, I shall now make an issue on the subject with those who contend that Christ or the apostles constituted a body of ecclesiastics as a divine corporation, in virtue of which they possess an exclusive commission to declare what are the true doctrines of Christianity, to administer sacraments as sanctifying ordinances, and of ordaining other persons to the exercise of the clerical function, so that any one who is not thus lawfully ordained, violates the institutions of Christ by undertaking to perform any of the acts above specified.

The mannner in which I think this issue can be best tried, is to *first* examine in chronological order the historical statements of the Acts of the apostles, wherever the subject of the ministry may be either mentioned or alluded to. *Secondly*, to examine the Epistles of the several apostles, in the order in which they are commonly supposed to have been written, as bearing on the particulars above mentioned. The evidence being thus brought fairly before the reader, he can draw his own conclusions, and as the best exposition of the advantages of such a mode of proceeding will be seen in the execution of it, I shall commence the investigation without further observation.

A few days after the unauthorized election of Matthias as an apostle, of which I have already spoken, the Jewish feast of Pentecost took place, when the manifestation of the Holy Spirit as had been promised by Christ, rested not upon the apostles exclusively, but as we have inferred at page 31, upon the whole one hundred and twenty disciples of our Saviour. But, be this as it may, the apostles immediately commenced to preach that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah or Christ, and their preaching was accompanied with such evidences of its truth, and of the divine approbation, that in a few days at least five thousand persons became converts to their doctrine, who made a common stock of their wealth and lived together on the contribution. But though they thus associated themselves together, they did not adopt any new form of religious worship, for it is stated (*Acts* ii. 46) "they continued daily with one accord in the temple," which necessarily implies the observance of the Mosaic institutions, and that they did not establish any peculiar form of religious services for themselves as a society of christians.

The phrase (*Acts* ii. 46) of "breaking bread from house to house," has been commonly supposed to imply the celebration of the Lord's supper, but this construction seems to me to be fanciful, the more legitimate sense appears to be that they eat their meals at the various houses into which the new sect were distributed, for there must have been a considerable number of houses thus designated

where five thousand persons lived on a common stock.

But though they did not abandon the observance of the institutions of Moses, yet certainly some regulations concerning their peculiar religious profession and management of their secular concerns must have been adopted among them.—The very distribution of the common funds, out of which they lived, necessarily implies this, as well as that important necessity which required them to meet together to be confirmed or instructed in the principles of the new faith they professed in Jesus of Nazareth as being the Messiah. These considations I presume induced them to assemble themselves together on the first day of the week, which probably soon became designated as the Lord's day, though that term does not occur in the New-Testament but once, and that in the book of Revelations (*chap.* i. 10) which was written about sixty-five years after our Saviour's crucifixion.

But though the necessity that some form of government at this time undoubtedly implies the fact that it did exist, yet nevertheless we have not the smallest information on the subject. We can only conjecture that certain regulations were recognized among them that were sufficient to the general purposes of convenience and edification. We have no reason however to believe that any definite form or peculiar system was established among them upon apostolic authority, for we find two years after the ascension of Christ, (*Acts* vi. 1, &c.) that in consequence of a complaint made by the Greek Jews against the Hebrew Jews, seven Greek Jews were elected to see that "their widows" should not be neglected in the distribution of the common fund. This fact shews the apostles did not consider themselves to have a divine right to legislate for the community, otherwise they would have remedied the complaint by their own authority, instead of appealing to the people as to the unreasonableness of expecting them as apostles to attend to matters which would interfere in their function of "preaching the word of God." It is impossible therefore to suppose that any prescribed form of church organization could have been promulgated at this time, for if so, the disciples could not have expected from the apostles, the most exalted persons in the congregation, the performance of services which could be rendered equally well by any merely upright men among their members.

Though the New Testament does not designate the seven persons chosen on this occasion by any particular appellation, it has been the practice of christians to call them *deacons*, which if understood in the primative sense of the term as mere *attendants, servants*, &c., is perfectly correct.*—The function however of these seven persons was local and peculiar, and did not exist in any other community but where men lived on a common fund, which we have no reason to think prevailed elsewhere in the christian world than at Jerusalem.* The deacons mentioned in the epistles to Timothy and Titus were a class of church officers who were to be found in every christian congregation, and whom we suppose exercised functions that comprehended the duties both of the *Chazans* and *Parnasin* of the Jewish synagogue. See Vol. 1. 509, &c.

The christian church, some two or three centuries after this time, appear to have generally fallen into the erroneous notion, that the office of deacon arose from the appointment of these seven persons by the apostles, and to this day the sixth chapter of Acts is read when those persons now called deacons are instituted in their office. The ignorance of the primitive christians, after the first century, of synagogue institutions perhaps was the cause of this oversight. I have met with but one instance where church authority has been expressly opposed to the ordinary belief, *viz.* the Synod of Trullo at Constantinople, who, A. D. 692, decreed that the seven persons appointed by the apostles were not of the same order as the deacons of the church.

In consequence of my very imperfect knowledge of the Greek language, I took it for granted that our English translation correctly stated the fact that the seven deacons, as they are called, had been ordained by an imposition of the hands of the apostles. As such a practice was conformable to what was done in the Jewish synagogues on certain occasions, I had no suspicion that the text as ordinarily understood was incorrect, until apprised of the fact by a Catholic friend, whose critical knowledge of the Greek language as respects the classical writings, is surpassed by few if any persons in the United States. He informed me that the grammatical construction of the passage undeniably was, that the GREEK JEWS, and not the

---

* The term deacon, as comprehending the persons, the office, and the verb from whence they are derived, is used ninety-eight times in the New Testament. In every instance they signify either servant, the office of a servant, or the verb to serve, unless it can be proved there is a different meaning implied when the deacons of the church are named. A few instances will be sufficient to shew the use of the Greek word *deacon* as rendered in our English translation.

His mother said unto the *servants*, which drew the water, &c.—*John* ii. 5, 9.

Whoever will be great among you let him be your *servant*.—*Matt.* xx. 26.

If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last and *servant*, &c.—*Mark* ix. 35.

If any man *serve me* (diacone) let him follow me, and where I am there shall also my *servant* be.—*John* xii. 26.

Jesus Christ was a *minister* of the circumcision.—*Rom.* xv. 8.

Who then is Paul and who Apollos but *ministers* by whom ye believed.—1 *Cor.* iii. 5.

Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light, wherefore it is no great thing if his *servants* be transformed as the *servants* of righteousness.—2 *Cor.* xi. 15.

* In the appointment of the seven persons mentioned in *Acts* vi. our translation has "*for this business*," as if an office, whereas the word is *chreia*, which properly signifies *need, emergency, exigency*, &c. This word occurs above forty times in the New-Testament, and in every other instance but this is uniformly rendered *need* or *necessity*.

apostles, *laid their hands on the so-called deacons*, and that it was impossible to give the passage any other construction without violating all correct principles of grammar. * * * The impossibility of referring this imposition of hands to the apostles by any construction of the Greek original, was clearly discerned by the writer of Beza's manuscript at Cambridge, who has inserted instead of *kai, and*, the word *oitines, who*, by which the imposition of hands *on the part of the apostles* is very clearly expressed. Griesbach however gives no other manuscript as containing this reading.

The force of our argument is also indirectly acknowledged by Bloomfield, *Recen. Synop.* For to sustain the ordinary interpretation of apostolic ordination, he makes use of the following assumption unwarranted by any construction of the Greek language. "As *kai proseuxamenoi* is to be referred to the apostles, the *kai* (and) has *the force of the pronoun relative*, as in *Mark* ii. 15.*

But nothing is more unjustifiable than this assertion, it being subversive of every principle of grammar to give a conjunction the sense of a pronoun.

The forced construction of Bloomfield, however, is a direct admission of the correctness of the translation given by my Catholic friend, for Bloomfield thus admits that the imposition of hands was *the act of the Greek Jews, and not of the apostles*, unless his violation of all grammatical construction can be sustained by making *kai*, the conjunction *and*, stand for the relative pronoun *who*. This however I presume neither he nor any one else can justify, but at any rate until the opponents of this criticism shall give their authorities for such violent rendering of the words, we shall contend for the accuracy of the translation as I have stated it.†

Furthermore, whatever may be the true interpretation of the passage, it is perfectly clear that this laying on of hands was not an *ecclesiastical ordination*, if that implies a communication of grace *by such imposition*, for these seven deacons had been expressly selected for their office in the fact, that they were already qualified *as being full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.—Acts* vi. 3.

Their ordination therefore was merely a public designation that these individuals were entrusted with the superintendence of the *temporal concern of the Greek Jews* in the distribution of the common funds.

The circumstance of the people laying their hands on persons who were to exercise an official position among them is recognized on a very important occasion in Jewish history. In *Num.* viii: 10, 11, we have these words: "And thou shalt bring the Levites before Jehovah, and the children of Israel *shall put their hands on the levites*. And Aaron shall offer the levites before Jehovah for an offering of the children of Israel, *that they* (the levites) may execute the service of Jehovah."

Whether the Greek Jews in selecting the seven persons called deacons, may have been influenced by the Jewish precedent or not we have no means of judging. In our estimate it was not unsuitable which is all we can venture to say on the matter.

The reader in estimating the exposition I have made on this subject, must not allow the prescription of the ordinary interpretation to influence his judgment, for the question is not to be determined by after practices of the christian churches. As the phrase *laying on of hands* occurs in the above instance for the first time in the New Testament, no precedent can be referred to, and hence we can only be governed in making a conclusion by the grammatical construction of the phraseology, which must not be perverted to make it sustain an ecclesiastical hypothesis, and especially so as the whole subject of *clerical ordination* is an exceedingly controverted subject.

After the appointment of the seven deacons, as they are called, there is nothing said in the Acts that has any bearing on church officers or church government until chap. xi. 30, which simply mentions that a collection in money for the relief of their poor brethren in Judea was paid over to the *elders* by Barnabas and Paul.

In *Acts* xiv. 23, we find that Paul and Barnabas in the discharge of a particular ministry that had been assigned them by the church at Antioch, are reported to have ordained *elders* (presbuteroi) in all the churches established by them. As this is the first place in which we read of the ordination of elders or presbyters we will quote the entire passage.

"And when they had preached the gospel to that city (Derbe) and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God. *And when they had ordained them elders* (presbuteroi) *in every church*, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed."

By this passage, for the first time since the day of Pentecost, or about seventeen years after that event, we find that at some time during that interval, that churches had been established among the Gentiles, and that certain persons under the name of elders or presbyters had been ordained in every congregation. But what we are to understand by the terms *elder*, or *ordain*, is not signified in the least degree.

Allowing others to make what inferences they please from this passage, I contend that there is nothing here stated that is in any wise inconsistent with my exposition page 184, as to what is done in the constituting a class-leader among the Methodists, *viz.* that the apostles merely designated lay-

* I am wholly at a loss to understand why this reference has been made, for it has no connection whatever with the subject. It may perhaps be a typographical misprint.

† In case any one may be perplexed by the supposition that our argument on the ordination of deacons conflicts with the observation made by the apostles (*Acts* vi. 3,) "*whom we may appoint*," &c. I beg leave to remark that I understand the expression *we*, not to mean the apostles exclusively, but as implying the whole brotherhood. Such a phrase is very common among ourselves; we hear public speakers continually say let *us*, *we* will, or *we* ought to do so and so.

men among their converts who exercised a superintendence over their life and morals, and led their religious services when they met together for purposes of edification.

In *Acts* xv. 1, &c. which relates an occurrence that took place about twenty-three years after Christ's ascension, we find Paul and Barnabas sent to Jerusalem to consult the "apostles and *elders*," (presbuteroi) concerning the necessity of observing the rite of circumcision. The 4th and 6th verses of this chapter evidently recognize the apostles and elders as conjointly constituting a tribunal to whose authority the body of Christians at large respectfully submitted the points in controversy. We might have anticipated the concession of such authority to the apostles, but who were these *elders* (presbuteroi) thus expressly associated with them in this ruling council? Were they persons ecclesiastically ordained to this office, or were they merely respectable or influential persons acting in the primitive sense of the term *elders* (zokonem) as wise or experienced laymen of acknowledged piety and influence. (See Vol. I. 136.) It is most probable the last supposition is correct, for the determination of the assembly on the points submitted to them, (*Acts* xv. 22, 24.) is given in the combined names of "*the apostles, and elders, and brethren*," *i. e.* of the whole church at Jerusalem. Such a proceeding has none of the peculiarities of an ecclesiastical council or corporation, for if the brethren or whole membership be thus included in the determiation given, then certainly the enumeration of *the elders* in the same act, cannot determine whether they are to be regarded in a civil or ecclesiastical capacity. That the term was used at this time among the Jews in a civil sense, is plainly inferrible from Paul's observation (*Acts* xxii. 5) that he went to Damascus with authority from the high priest *and all the estate of the elders*, &c. (presbuterion)—See also Math. xxvi. 59; xxvii. 1.

In the seventeenth verse of *Acts* xx. we again meet with a fact shewing an organization of christian churches under the direction of elders. This passage, together with verse 28, is of some importance in the controversy concerning Diocesan Episcopacy, for those persons termed in the seventeenth verse *elders*, (presbuteroi,) are the very same individuals that in the 28th verse are called *overseers*, but which ought to have been rendered *bishops*, (episcopoi.) as our translators have done every where else, but as this would have justified the objections made in those days against their episcopal hypothesis, they have evasively employed another word which though literally correct, is not so in a technical sense. In other words, they were guilty of a *suppressio veri*, *i. e.* they told the truth, but not the honest truth.

It is a further argument against Diocesan Episcopacy that both the seventeenth and twenty-eighth verses of this chapter recognize several *elders, or bishops* as attached to the church at Ephesus which is directly contrary to the hypothesis that there was but one bishop to a diocese.

I apprehend we derive a strong objection against the theory that the apostles had established any divine corporation of ecclesiastics as the "*church*" at this time, from what is communicated to us in the twenty-ninth and thirty-first verses of *Acts* xx. Paul there expressly says, that "grievous wolves would hereafter appear among them not sparing the flock. Also *of your own selves*," (*i. e.* of the bishops or elders.) "shall men arise *speaking perverse things* to draw away disciples after them. Therefore *watch and remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one, night and day with tears.*"

Yet notwithstanding this annunciation, Paul does not make the least reference to any ecclesiastical corporation or church, with whom the truth might be supposed to be found, or to whom they should have recourse amidst the confusion that would hereafter be the result of different elders or bishops preaching "*perverse things.*" It is therefore seemingly incredible that Paul could at this time have recognised any divinely appointed body of clergy to instruct man with authority, for if he had, he never could have omitted to declare the remedy when he foretold the mischief that would surely come.

In *Acts* xxi. 17, 18, Paul is stated to have arrived at Jerusalem, "and the day following Paul went in with us unto James, and *all the elders* (presbuteroi) were present." If there is any force in words, these imply that the christian church was not governed by the apostles exclusively, but that a body of *elders* was associated with them. Under what peculiarities of organization this council was constituted, we know not, but they evidently had authority at least to recommend what pertained to religious practice, and it is equally evident they had not yet organized themselves into a society based upon the peculiarities of christian institutions and appointments, though it was now thirty-one years since our Savior's ascension to heaven. They still continued zealous in the observance of the Jewish ceremonial law, and even induced Paul to assist in a Nazarite purification, which I must acknowledge I do not comprehend how he could participate in consistently with his avowed opinions and practice elsewhere.

After this time there is nothing related in the Acts that has any bearing on the subject of church officers or christian ecclesiastical institutions.

(To be continued.)

The Destroyer of Anti-Christ.

THE question is not whether Mr. Barnes is a millenarian or not; but it is simply this: Is the exposition which Mr. Barnes has given us of 2 Thess. 2: 8, the correct one or not? If his exposition of the Greek words *Epiphaneia* and *parousia*, rendered *brightness* and *coming*, be not correct, will the Editor of the Christian Observer, or some of his numerous readers be so kind as to show us the fallacy of his reasoning, and the defect of his exegesis? If they cannot do it let them candidly acknowledge the fact. We want honest criticism such as Mr. Barnes has given us in his exposition of this passage, and not the pious wishes or feelings of good men in the case. When we get the true meaning of the spirit in the passage, every one can make his own inferences.

Our design is not to imput
timent that he does not ho
truth. All we say is, that M
of 2 Thess. 2: 8, is directly
ualizing theory, which teache
tian power spoken of in t
destroyed by the simple prea
God. Mr. B. says, the idea is
appear, and that this anti-chri
destroyed by His appearing;
when He shall return. The
would not be His brightn
would seem to follow from th
enormous power of wickednes
by the truth, the final triu
reserved for the Son of man
return to our world." Wit
cordially agree. Will any o
this is not the correct expos
We forewarn him that he
before him.

Holding, as we do, that M
this passage is the true one,
diced man to say whether ou
passage is not legitimately dr
christ must exist during the
of the Church, and on to the e
Lord must come *personally*, a
nium, and destroy Anti-chris
The reasoning is this:
Anti-christ will be destroy
on His second return to our
But our Lord will not re
till the end of the world:
Therefore Anti-christ will
the world.
This is a legitimate anti-
Or this;
Anti-christ is to be destroy
self on his second return to ou
But Anti-christ cannot e
dispensation of the Church; f
the Lord.
Therefore our Lord will co
nium and destroy Anti-Christ
This is the millenarian vie
Will some one be kind enou
Mr. B.'s exposition is not corr
ference is not legitimately dra
On 2 Thess. 2; 8, Olshaus
Anomos, (the wicked one, ref
sin.) thinks he has attained to
of his universal monarchy, in
all spiritual and worldly powe
—Christ will annihilate him
—"The combination *Epiphan*
brightness of His coming whic
is, however, peculiar. Here
ogy is to be explained so that
ness.) denotes the *subjective*,
the *objective* aspect, that is, t
puts forward the actuality of
the *former* one the contemplat
of man, the consciousness of H
it appears that Mr. Barnes
agree in the exposition of this
Chris. Observer.]

Our design is not to impute to any one, any sentiment that he does not honestly hold to be the truth. All we say is, that Mr. Barnes' exposition of 2 Thess. 2 : 8, is directly opposed to the spiritualizing theory, which teaches that the anti-christian power spoken of in this passage, is to be destroyed by the simple preaching of the word of God. Mr. B. says. the idea is " He (Christ) would *appear*, and that this anti-christian power would be destroyed by His appearing ; that is by *Himself*, when He shall return. The agency in doing it, would not be His brightness, but *Himself*. It would seem to follow from this, that however this enormous power of wickedness might be weakened by the truth, the final triumph over it would be reserved for the Son of man Himself on His *second return* to our world." With this exposition we cordially agree. Will any one make it plain that this is not the correct exposition of the passage. We forewarn him that he has a Herculean work before him.

Holding, as we do, that Mr. B.'s exposition of this passage is the true one, we ask any unprejudiced man to say whether our inference from the passage is not legitimately drawn, viz. : that Anti-christ must exist during the millennial dispensation of the Church, and on to the end of time ; or else our Lord must come *personally*, and *before* the millennium, and destroy Anti-christ.

The reasoning is this :

Anti-christ will be destroyed by Christ Himself, on His second return to our world :

But our Lord will not return the second time till the end of the world :

Therefore Anti-christ will exist till the end of the world.

This is a legitimate anti-millenarian inference. Or this ;

Anti-christ is to be destroyed by our Lord Himself on his second return to our world ;

But Anti-christ cannot exist in the millennial dispensation of the Church ; for then all shall know the Lord.

Therefore our Lord will come *before* the millennium and destroy Anti-Christ.

This is the millenarian view of the subject.—Will some one be kind enough to show us that Mr. B.' exposition is not correct, and that our inference is not legitimately drawn.

On 2 Thess. 2 ; 8, Olshausen says—" When the *Anomos*, (the wicked one, referring to the man of sin,) thinks he has attained to all in the possession of his universal monarchy, in which he has united all spiritual and worldly power in his own person. —Christ will annihilate him by His appearance." —" The combination *Epiphaneia tes parousias*, the brightness of His coming which is found here only, is, however, peculiar. Here the apparent tautology is to be explained so that *Epiphaneia*, (brightness.) denotes the *subjective*, *parousia*, (coming,) the *objective* aspect, that is, this latter expression puts forward the actuality of Christ's appearing, the *former* one the contemplation of it on the part of man, the consciousness of His presence." Thus it appears that Mr. Barnes and Dr. Olshausen agree in the exposition of this passage.

Chris. Observer.] WM. RAMSEY.

From T. J. Harris, Harrisburgh, Pa.

Br. Storrs ;—I for one would like to have the BIBLE EXAMINER published weekly, if possible : but semi-monthly at least. I am really astonished that out of at least 100,000 believers in the United States, there cannot be obtained enough subscribers to pay for the publishing of a single paper. I know several believers in the doctrine who are not too poor, but fancy themselves unable to pay, but who, at the same time, probably give double the amount to sectarian churches, or who would pay $3 for a ticket to hear "JENNY" sing. I wish you to continue to send me the EXAMINER, and I will pay you $5 for the year, and you can send me 1, 2, or 3 copies. as you can afford. One copy I *must have ;* and if you send me more I will give them away, not to swine, but to the heathen round about, for we need not go to Japan to find them.

From J. W. Dye, Onondaga Co., N. Y.

Br. Storrs :—I am not one that has been contemplating withdrawing my support from the EXAMINER, and, silently or any other way, saying "Farewell" to its *Editor*. I have received through the EXAMINER too much valuable instruction and advice—have been too much benefitted by its truths to do so now, even if I should see something in it that I could not assent to. Once I could not have assented to these great and fundamental truths which it constantly proclaims, and in which I now, with many others, rejoice.

I am glad to see that you do not manifest any thing like a disposition to surrender your *personal* independence and right to proclaim to the world what your firm conviction of truth is ; and may the God of all truth be your support and comfort in all the trying scenes you may have to pass through, and, at last, crown you, with all the lovers of our Lord, with *Endless Life* in his everlasting Kingdom.

I have some friends that I would be glad to have read the EXAMINER, and I think if it was put into their hands, free of cost, their prejudice might be so far overcome that they would read it, and, perhaps, be benefitted by it. Therefore I enclose five dollars for three copies.

If I had the means, I would take pleasure in paying for, and sending it to a great many ; but I have not.

If I live, and have my health, you shall have a small donation from me, as I consider it my duty and it is a pleasure to give in support of the Lord's Gospel : and especially to those of his servants who have made great sacrifices of popularity, friends, wealth, and have forsaken all for the honor of being a good minister of Jesus Christ.

Yours, in hope of Life Eternal, through Jesus.

REASONS WHY *we should attend to the Lord's Supper.*—1. Christ commands it. But suppose he did not. 2. He recommends it. 3. The circumstances under which it was instituted—*Just before his death.* 4. Its uses to ourselves; by calling to mind his love. 5. Because it is an open confession of Christ. There is no other ordinance which is *alone peculiar* to christianity.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 1, 1856.

Proof of Immortality.

Dreams are, in some degree, a proof of immortality,—as an evidence that the mind is not so fettered by the body as to be incapable of a separated and higher existence.—*True Wesleyan.*

Dogs and other brutes "dream!" Is that "in some degree, a proof of immortality?" Does it prove "that the" dog's "mind is not so fettered by the body as to be incapable of a separate and higher existence?" Yes, just as much and as truly as man's dreaming does. *Mind*, in all created beings, is the result of a living organism. Till our *dreamers* can show us mind where there is no such organism they cry in vain "O Baal, save us!" To the law and testimony, if any man speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. Where is "the law and testimony" that saith man has an *immortal mind? No where.* Then "let him who hath a dream tell a dream; but he that hath" God's "word let him speak it plainly: What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the LORD."

QUERIES. 1st. In 1 Thes. 5: 23, are we taught that it takes spirit, soul and body to constitute a man? or, was not Paul speaking of the whole Church?

2d. Does Luke 24: 37–39, teach that there is such a thing as a spirit that has not flesh and bones? or, is there not a mistranslation in this scripture? W. H. W.

ANSWER. 1st. We think the apostle's language may be understood either way; and then imports no more than a wish that all their *tempers*, or dispositions, and *minds* and *animal nature* might be in subjection to God and consecrated to his service; and he wished and prayed that such might be the state of the whole church.

2d. Luke 24 does not teach, we think, that there is any such thing as a spirit that has not flesh and bones, if by spirit is meant an intelligent created being. The term spirit, Lk. 24: 37—39, is used, we judge, in the same sense as in Mark 6: 49, where Jesus came to his disciples walking on the water, and they supposed it to be *a spirit—a phantazma*, a phantom: an unsubstantial appearance, but a terror to superstitious minds. Such appearances had not flesh and bones, nor was there any thing real about them. Still we are not to suppose that there are no real *material* beings who are constituted without flesh and bones, as we have. In what particular form God may cause real beings to exist, it is in vain for us to speculate: yet so far as known to us, all are connected with matter.

MORE QUERIES.—*Br. Storrs:*—I have a few questions to ask you; they puzzle me some. I think it the strongest argument our opponents have for disembodied spirits. The first is in Mark 5, concerning the man in the tombs, who said, "My name is Legion, for we are many." Now, the account says, there was about two thousand swine; and allowing one spirit for each, there must have been truly many in him, as he said.

Also the case of Mary Magdelene, from whom seven were cast out. If I understand you right, you think all spiritual beings have bodily form, and are matter of some kind. Now, how could so many material devils occupy the same space in man at one and the same time? I have no doubt but this has puzzled others beside me. If you can throw any light on the subject, please do it, and oblige your friend and brother.

Yours, in the hope of life through Jesus Christ alone. JOHN B. DODGE.

ANSWER.—A few words is all we can now give to the questions of Br. DODGE. The subject of *demoniacal* possessions is one that has "puzzled" wiser heads than ours. We shall not, at present, go into the question whether *Demons* are personal beings or only *imaginary* ones. The condition and actions of some men, in all ages, especially in times of apostacy and superstition, has led some to think there are invisible evil beings that act upon men, producing the phenomenon of madness, etc. Supposing it to be so, there is no evidence from the Bible that they were actually *inside* of men or swine, "occupying space." The term translated "*cast out*," in the Greek, is *ek-ballo*, from *ek*, which signifies not only *out of*, but also "*away from*"—"*off;*" "*ballo*," "*to throw, to fling, to hurl, to thrust*," etc. The word then signifies not only to *cast out*, but "*to hurl* AWAY FROM—*to send off.*" Let us look at Matt. 8: 31, the parallel to Mark 5th: "So the *Damones* besought him, saying if thou *ekballeis*—send us off—suffer us to go *eis—to* the herd of swine."

We will look at a few texts where the word is translated "*send forth*," etc. Math. 9: 38, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he will *ekballee—send forth* laborers into his harvest." Math. 12: 20, "Smoking flax shall he not quench till he *ekballee—send forth* judgment unto victory." Mark 1: 12, "Immediately the spirit *ekballie—driveth* him" [Jesus] "into the wilderness." Verse 43, Jesus "charged him, and forthwith *ekballen—sent* him *away;*" that is, the man he had just healed of leprosy.

These examples are sufficient to show that our

" opponents," as usual, stand on slippery ground when they attempt to prove the demons were literally *inside* of the possessed.

We may obtain further light by comparing Gal. 4 : 30, *Ekballe*—" *cast out* the bond woman," with Gen. 21 : 14, "And Abraham * * * *sent* her *away*." There is no necessity therefore for supposing, if the *demons* were personal beings they were actually *within* the person possessed. God is said to *dwell* IN MEN ; see 1 John 4 : 12, 13. We have the nature of this *dwelling* in us explained in Rom. 8 : 9–11. We do not suppose that the Godhead, *personally*, dwells in man ; but He does by His Spirit, or divine influence. So neither are we to suppose that any created existence, or being—whether *Satan, Diabolos*, or *Demons*, if they have *personality*, dwell *personally* in any man ; but men are under their *influence*—they are *mesmerized* by them, so that they *talk* and *act* just according to *his*, or *their will*.

We see nothing, therefore, to "*puzzle*" us at all in the cases Br. DODGE refers to. The *demons* —*devils* might be " legions," or tens of legions, and the texts give no evidence of such an indwelling as some suppose : the most that can be said is, that they exercised an influence on the person's mind, by which he or she was controlled; and when that influence was broken, as it was by Jesus, the demons were *ekballe—sent off from*, or *away from* the person, and they came to their senses again, and acted like rational beings—were " in their right mind."

THE EASTERN WAR.

An English writer on prophecy, from whom we quoted in April, 1854, in relation to the " *Projects of France*," still continues to issue *Tracts* on the same subject. In one issued October last he speaks of "*The Eagle*" as the " legionary standard of the Old *Roman Empire*" ; which, after it was overwhelmed by the northern invasions, rose again at the end of fourteen hundred years under the auspices of NAPOLEON I., but was again overwhelmed at Waterloo. Forty years then passed, and the ROMAN EAGLE soared again with wings as firm and youthful as before. After dwelling in few words on the English for having now trusted this new development under NAPOLEON III., he proceeds as follows :—

The Roman Eagle is aloft again, and now let us see the direction of his flight—let us descend to plain matter of fact. The Eagle-standards were first concentrated in Paris, around one dark, silent, and impenetrable man—the representative of the First Napoleon. This man has invariably announced himself as the Man of Destiny—under the influence of some fatal star—predestined to avenge his predecessor, and to revive his empire. With far greater wisdom than the former Napoleon, he proceeds, step by step, and regulates the flight of his eagles by some magic influence. ROME, as the capital of the Roman world, was fixed upon as the first object of his ambition. With profound sagacity, he discerned that Rome is the only starting-point of universal dominion. It is, indeed, most marvellous to observe, that for 2500 years, under all the changes and revolutions of the world, the centre of influence and empire has been connected with Rome. He saw this well ; and the first flight of his eagles was directed upon Rome. Before he had been six months President of France he was master of the Seven Hills ; he had secured the seat of empire before he seized the title of " Emperor." His eagles rested for awhile on the summit of the Seven Hills, and looked around for another prey. The second capital of the Roman Empire was the most appropriate subject for his next adventure. He got up an artificial excitement, and an *artificial war ;* and led England to join him in his aggression. The British Bull awoke from his emerald meadows, and with the most comical evolutions gambolled after the Eagle. A race between an Eagle and a Bull was a novelty in the order of things, and all Europe looked on as much amused as alarmed. The issue of the race was just what might have been expected. While the Bull was floundering in the mire of Balaclava the fiery Eagle soared up on his boldest wing, and stooped at once upon the Russian fortress. He has got it, and he will keep it—for it was the Eagle alone who gained THAT day. The Franco-Roman Eagle sits alone on the towers of Sebastopol, and looks down upon sea and land as subject to himself alone. But in his midway flight from Paris to the Crimæa, the Eagle paused awhile at Athens and Constantinople, and fixed his talons deeply in both ; and before he proceeded in his northward flight, he had so maimed and overawed the Greek and Turkish capitals, as to be secure of each whenever he may require it for his prey. The Bull stands knee-deep in the mire, and bellows out his approbation ! And, however Europe may be alarmed at the fiery vehemence of the Eagle, and the lumbering of the Bull, it cannot but laugh at the inequality of the match, and the certain failure of the four-footed competitor.

To speak in less figurative terms, we have chosen the title of the "Eagle Standard," in order in the first place to express the rapidity and decision of the Imperial progress ; and, in the next place to point out the extraordinary circumstance, that the New-Napoleonic empire is assuming all the attributes of the ancient Roman one ! It had, long ago, assumed the Roman standard. It is now taking the exact outline of the empire of the CÆSARS. Beginning on the shores of the Western Ocean, and within the *limits* of ancient Gaul ; it is so far strictly a part of the old empire of Rome. But when the third Napoleon ascended the throne, his empire, being nearly confined to France, was no more than a *province* of the ancient Roman world. He at once secured Rome itself, and from

that moment he became the representative of the ancient Cæsars. But still he knew well that he was only a shadowy representative—the mere *ghost* of the Cæsars. It was necessary that the shadowy outline should be filled up with flesh and blood. He had already got Algeria, the ancient Roman Numidia, the classic territory of Marius and of Sallust. He must proceed, step by step, to complete and fill up the whole body of the empire. Having advanced from Paris to Rome, his next most appropriate advance was from Rome to Athens—from the renowned capital of ancient arms to the equally renowned capital of ancient arts. Athens he has seized; and he next advanced to Constantinople—the gateway of the East, and the capital of all the empires of Islamism!—the representative of the whole Mahometan world. He is thus, this moment, the master of all the sources of influence and power which sway the human mind. The spiritual despotism of Rome—the historic fame of Athens—the superstitious veneration which binds the Eastern world to Constantinople—the elegance, genius, and splendour which attaches the Western world to Paris—all these, at once, are placed at his command, and used as weapons in his conquests; while his alliance with England, and our complete dependence upon his smallest caprice, have made him master of the last and only obstacle which could have retarded his designs—the naval and commercial power of Great Britain.

But he has advanced, and is now advancing much further than this. In the last number it was remarked that he had made a treaty with PERSIA. This has since been confirmed; the treaty has been signed and sealed, and his influence extended directly across the two continents, from Paris to Ispahan. Nor is this all. For the King of Birmah is about to send an ambassador to the court of the Tuileries, the first embassy that he has ever sent to any European court. Observe! the Burmese have not sent an ambassador to England, although we are their nearest neighbours, in the East. They send their ambassador to the French Emperor, not to us, as if they had discovered (with their well-known sagacity) that the destinies of the East are as much dependent upon France, as the destinies of the West. This is a very significant event in itself; but it may be far more important in its consequences. The Birman Empire closes in upon the Eastern frontier of BRITISH INDIA. Persia approaches the British territory on the North-west. The Affghans, who lie between India and Persia, most justly hate us, because, without the slightest offence or provocation, we most basely invaded their country, and killed (without provocation) 20,000 men! This awful crime, which can never be forgotten before God, is well remembered among men, and the Affghans hate us as we hate the Russians, only that they have some reason for their hatred. Now let us look to the results. Constantinople, Persia, the Birman Empire, all in league with France, the Affghans ready to join the league at the slightest invitation. Look at your map and you will see that British India is threatened in front and flank by this ominous league! North, North-west, and South-east, the allies of France close in upon British India, and offer both an *auxiliary contingent* and (far worse) a *military road* to a force advancing from the Dardanelles! And the Dardanelles are in possession of France. Truly! we are a sagacious people. For want of a better excuse for killing 200,000 of our fellow creatures, we pretend that we went to war for the preservation of India, lest Russia should make her way to Hindostan across the Turkish and Persian territories. And now we have so bungled the war, that we have handed over Turkey, Persia, and even the Birman empire to the French Emperor, to a man whose very name of "Napoleon" is the exponent and war-cry of Oriental conquest; with whom to conquer the East, and avenge the defeat of Acre is an hereditary principle; a religion more sacred than the Cross. Do you think he does not see his opportunity? Or do you doubt that while you are shedding torrents of blood, to save India from Russia, you are not *by that very bloodshed*, giving India to France? The case is too evident to require proof. Scripture tells us of a woman who betrayed her husband's secret, in order to save herself from being burnt, and the immediate consequence of this treachery was, that the Philistines came up and burnt her and her family with fire. (Judges 14 and 15.) We have shed the blood of myriads in order to save our Indian possessions, and by the very act of shedding that blood we are giving them over to France. Nothing but infatuation sent by God, for our enormous Indian crimes, can account for the idiotcy of our conduct. In every case we are doing, by means of war and bloodshed, the very thing which we have gone to war in order to prevent.

But this is not all. There are other points to be considered in the Oriental question. If you look at the map you will find that there is a wide interval between the Dardanelles and Persia, and so wide an interval would be a serious military defect without some intermediate point of connexion. In all great military operations, there must be connecting points between the extreme ends of the line; strong positions and reserves to fall back upon; magazines and stores at practicable distances. To an army advancing from the West, SYRIA and PALESTINE present these requisites in perfection. Syria, the Euphrates, and Persia, form an unbroken line of military communication. A better line, at least, than Russia ever could have found, in advancing from the Crimæa. Syria runs up to the Euphrates, the Euphrates falls into the Persian Gulf, and Persia borders upon Affghanistan. Palestine is remarkably strong, full of military positions, and in fact *Palestine is the key of the East*, as Constantinople is the key of the *North-East*.

Fully alive to these considerations, our beloved Ally, who longs to embrace his friends in *every* part of the world, is now manœuvreing to get immediate possession of Jerusalem and Palestine. Not satisfied that he has already got the key of the Dardanelles, he is determined likewise to secure the keys of the East. A French ambassador is, at this moment, in Rome, in consultation with Pius the Ninth, for the purpose of completing an ar-

rangement with reference to the KEYS OF THE HOLY PLACES OF JERUSALEM. The French envoy is next to proceed from Rome to Jerusalem, in order to carry the measure into effect. Having thus secured the keys of the Holy Places, it will be necessary, and even laudable, to send a French force to Palestine, since very serious collisions have lately occurred between the holy men of the Greek and Roman Churches in Jerusalem. With the praiseworthy design of preventing this in future, our benevolent Ally will dispatch a few regiments to Palestine—by and by, a few more—until he has got complete possession of the Holy Land. And having secured the Holy Land, nothing will be more natural than to restore the Jews, for the Jews can fight stoutly in their own territory, and will serve as a reinforcement to the French army of occupation; while the wealthy Jews, who are on the most intimate terms with Napoleon, will furnish millions of money to support the man who restores them to their native country. Indeed the seizure of Palestine, and the restoration of the Jews, would be the wisest course which the Emperor could pursue, not only politically but financially; for his wars are unusually expensive, and the Jews have more disposable capital than any other people in the world.

One thing, however, is certain, that after the fall of Sebastopol, the French envoy was sent at once to secure the keys of the Holy Places. Rome itself was the first position secured—Rome was the first act of the GREAT DRAMA; Athens was the second; Constantinople was the third; Sebastopol the fourth; and now, Jerusalem is the fifth! What will be the next act of this many-scened tragedy?

Nor has a single measure been overlooked which could strengthen his hold upon the East. Wherever we look everything is provided for with unerring sagacity. ABDEL KADER, the greatest hero of the age, the chieftain of the Saracen race, has been attached to the Emperor by every act of liberality and munificence. For life or death the Arabian Emir is the vassal of Napoleon. Terrified by the earthquake at Broussa, the Emir could find no place of security but one; no place was secure from earthquakes but Damascus, which was a strange discovery, as Syria is most particularly liable to earthquakes. But though strange, it was *convenient*. Damascus is the heart of Syria, and the very best position for a military vassal of the French Emperor. And now Abdel-Kader is on his way to the renowned city of the White Caliphs, to assemble to his standard all the warlike tribes of Mount Libanus and Syria, and to make their innumerable cavalry tributaries to France. Nothing can be better planned than the transmitting of Abdel-Kader to Damascus. It is neither more nor less than placing a French Marshal at the head of fifty thousand cavalry and half a million of infantry, in the most central position of Western Asia—and its results will appear in due time.

But this is not all. The last Turkish loan has been most dexterously secured upon the revenues of SYRIA and of EGYPT. The Turks are insolvent, they cannot pay the interest upon the loan beyond the first year. The French government has guaranteed the loan; when the interest cannot be paid, the French government will come down upon Syria and Egypt; the mortgage will be foreclosed! and Syria and Egypt, or one of them, at least, will become the property of France! But the Turkish loan will be taken by the JEWS, and the Jews, being the creditors, will be repaid by getting possession of the Syrian territory or of Palestine, which is part of Syria; so that, in the most natural manner in the world, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Abdel-Kader, and the Jews, will slide into the hands of Napoleon the Third; and all without the slightest moral obliquity—all in defence of the slavery—we mean the liberties of Europe, which being threatened by the approach of Russia to the Danube, will now be beautifully defended by the occupation of the Turkish empire by France. Virtue is its own reward! * * *

So far the French Emperor has advanced, or is advancing, in the direct route to India. And while we are guilty of the most atrocious bloodshed in order to secure India from Russia, Almighty God has, most righteously, decreed that we should sell our lives and colonies to France! The justice of God is unmistakable—the sagacity of our enemy is miraculous. Observe how he is acting: He does not waste his time in getting possession of the intermediate and subordinate points; he leaves them to themselves, and passes on to the vital positions, the command of which gives him the command of the intervening territory. Having first secured France, he then passes on, at once, to Rome. From Rome to Athens, from Athens to Constantinople, from Constantinople to Damascus, from Damascus to Jerusalem. These positions command the intervening territory, and make him master of the whole line of march, without any necessity of intermediate conquest; just as a man who had got possession of London, Chatham, and Dover, would be virtually master of the whole intervening district. This economy of conquest shews how well he understands his trade, and will add greatly to the rapidity of his progress. * * *

We ventured to remark in February, 1854, on the the dexterity of France in producing an eternal enmity between you and Russia. Russia was *your only ally*. You had alienated the rest of Europe, by exciting the people to insurrection. You had alienated the "people" themselves by leaving them in the hands of the executioner, without one effort to save them after you yourselves had excited them to revolt! You had no ally upon earth but Russia, and now you have lost her for ever; and all the world will look on well-pleased should your pride and self-conceit be brought down by France. Do you think that America would help you? America would join in alliance against you to-morrow, for the sake of your West Indian Islands—and is, in fact, waiting, this moment, the first opportunity for seizing them! You have not *now* one friend left upon earth: and do you dare to hope for aid from GOD, whose holy name you have defiled by hypocrisy and blood?

The Franco-Roman Eagle has now spread his wings for a bolder flight than he ever essayed even under the first Napoleon. From the towers of

Notre Dame to Rome, from Rome to Athens, from Athens to the Hellespont, from the Hellespont to Damascus, from Damascus to Jerusalem. There appear to be no limits to his flight until he have reached the Euphrates or the Indus—and he seems to realize the words of Scripture :—"Wheresoever the carcase is, thither will the EAGLES be gathered together." (Luke 17.) One thing is certain—that you yourselves have carried the French eagles much nearer to India, at the expense of your own blood, than ever the Russians could have reached in the same time, had you completely abstained from going to war. And though your mock-preachers have told you that slaughter is the duty of a Christian, not one of them has had penetration enough to discover that you were fighting against yourselves. "Like people, like priest," says Hosea ; and so it is now. Priests and people alike, are blundering on in the mire of ruin, as much as in the mire of national crime.

CORRECTION.—*Dear Brother :*—You will do me the justice to correct a mistake of no little consequence. Respondent represents me as admitting that there is "not one solitary text, in all the Book, that *plainly affirms*" that the wicked dead will be made alive in order to be judged. Now, I admit no such thing. I understand John 5 : 28 and 29, and other passages, as "*plainly affirming*" the fact.

To set aside the literal import of a word in a literal passage because the same word is used figuratively in a figurative passage, as in Ezek. 37, is inconsistent with all just rules of biblical interpretation.

Yours truly, HENRY GREW.

RESPONSE TO THE FOREGOING.—We are sorry that Bro. GREW should feel himself under the necessity of making a "*correction*" where we really see nothing to *correct*. He did give up 1 Corth. 15 : 22, as having no reference to the revival into life of the wicked. Respondent regarded that text, if there is any, the "*one solitary* text that *plainly affirms* it ;" and added that, in Respondent's *opinion*, "Br. G. now admits" there is none "*by giving up* 1 Corth. 15 : 22." If Respondent had closed his remark after the word "admits," then there would have been cause for correction : because Br. G. contends other texts do plainly affirm the living again of the wicked dead ; but Respondent does not *admit* it, and hence expressed his *opinion* that Br. G. by "giving up 1 Corth. 15 : 22" did, *in fact*, admit that the affirmative is a matter of *inference*. This point, however, is only a matter of *opinion*. Respondent is still of opinion John 5 : 28, 29 does *not* "*plainly affirm*," nor affirm *at all*, that the wicked dead shall be made *alive*. The righteous dead come "to the resurrection *of life*" : the wicked dead fall short of it, and come only "to the resurrection of *condemnation*." There is no life in their case ; at least, only by *inference ;* no plain affirmation.

As Br. G. seems not to approve of Respondent's use of Ezk. 37, in illustrating the subject, we have been led to look more closely at John 5 and Ezk. 37, and we were struck with the fact that our Lord's language in John 5 seems to have been based on Ezk. 37, as his language Mark 9 . 44 is based on Isa. 66 : 24. In John 5 our Lord had been speaking of himself as God's appointed Messenger to give *life* and to *execute* judgment ; and affirmed he had *power* to "*quicken* whom" he would ; and he tells his hearers "the hour now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God" ; for the Father "hath given to the Son to have life in himself" : hence he can make alive "whom he will" : and "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." Now, the works Christ wrought, in quickening many dead in sins among the Jews, and raising to life literal dead persons during his personal ministry, would be evidence that his claim of having power to quicken whom he would, and of executing judgment on all, was a true claim. And as he was addressing the Jews, who were seeking "to kill him" (verse 18) he goes on to tell the *Jews* it was *himself* the Father had given power to do what is plainly declared in Ezk. 37 God would do, *viz :*—"Behold, *O my people*, I will open your graves, and cause you to come out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel : and ye shall know that I am the LORD, when I have opened your graves, *O my people*, and brought *you* up out of your graves, and I will put *My Spirit in you* and *ye shall live*," &c.

Whatever this resurrection is—whether national, spiritual, or literal—it seems to our mind perfectly clear it is the *very same* Jesus speaks of John 5 : 28, 29. If one is *national* so is the other : if one is *spiritual* so is the other : if one is *literal* so is the other. They are *the same*, we judge. If any choose to say, it is *literal ;* then none but God's "*people*" are made *alive :* none others are embraced in Ezekiel's prophecy ; and none others receive *life* in our Lord's declaration of his bringing men from the graves, John 5. We say again, the scenes are one. The Jews certainly understood the fulfillment of the prophecy of Ezk. 37 to be in the future when Jesus spoke in their hearing John 5 : 28, 29 ; and it seems to us perfectly evident it was to that prophecy he referred, and claimed that he would fulfill it. He tells them not to "marvel"

at his statements, that God had given him "life in himself"—"authority to execute judgment"—"to quicken whom he will," &c, "for the hour is coming, in the which" that still more wonderful prophecy of Ezekiel should be fulfilled, and he would open the graves of God's "*people*" and bring them "to the resurrection of *life*"; while at the same time the doers of evil—like themselves, who "sought to kill him"—at this resurrection should be noticed, but only "to condemnation": *condemned* to what? "*Not see life*": John 3 : 36. Thus our Lord and Ezekiel harmonize; and one throws light on the other; and neither give any countenance to the idea than any wicked man is to be made alive from literal death. So it looks to us.

Will any Dead be made Alive Mortal?

Dear Brother Storrs;—Respondent proposes for consideration the fourth question, *viz*, "Do the scriptures *distinctly* teach that any who are made alive by a resurrection, at the last day, are *mortal?*"

We are happily agreed that the penalty of the divine law is literal "*death*," or cessation of conscious being, Rom. 6 : 23; and that there is no deliverance from this awful doom, but by vital union of penitent man to the Son of God. "The gift of God is eternal Life through Jesus Christ our Lord." "He that hath the Son hath LIFE and he that hath not the Son of God hath not *life*." 1 John 5 : 12. John 3 : 36. Consequently, we agree, that if the impenitent and unbelieving are raised to life at all, it must be a "mortal" and not an *immortal* life.

I have presented to our readers numerous divine testimonies, which in my view, teach a universal judgment both of a *judicial* and *executive* character: passages which declare facts relative to the judgment of the wicked, which necessarily imply life and its functions, such as hearing, suffering, &c. Connecting these passages with the class, relative to the penalty of the divine law, the conclusion plainly is, that many who will be made alive by "a resurrection (to) condemnation," will be still "*mortal*" and liable to a "second death." Rev. 20 : 14. *Therefore,* I have no need of adducing any other proof to sustain the affirmative of the fourth question than what I have already presented.

Admitting, as we do, that the condemnation of the wicked is to everlasting death; the Savior, I conceive, *does* "*distinctly* teach that (many will be) made alive by a resurrection at the last day, who are *mortal*" and will die "the second death." "ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation." John 5 : 28, 29. I see no authority, dear brother, in all the passages Respondent has quoted, for setting aside the literal sense of our Saviour's words, which sense I think that I have also confirmed by other passages.

The revelation of a "second death" and of persons being "*hurt*" thereby, (clearly implied in Rev. 2 : 11,) teaches that some will be "made alive by a resurrection" in a "mortal" state. There can be no *second* death without a resurrection to temporary life from the *first*.

The sacred scriptures "distinctly teach that some will be made alive by a resurrection," in a "mortal" state, by teaching, as our Saviour does, Math. 10 : 28, Luke 12 : 5, that there is something for men to fear "AFTER (being) killed" in the first death; viz: a destruction of soul and body in gehenna, or "lake of fire," which Peter teaches us will be the conflagration of the present earth. 2 Peter 3 : 6. Now, brother, if the first death terminates all consciousness forever, then there is nothing more or "after" that to fear. Please observe, it is not merely everlasting destruction, that the Saviour teaches them to fear, but a destruction of a *peculiar kind*, a destruction in gehenna, or lake of fire, Luke 12 : 5. "Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell," &c. Matt. 5 : 29 also. A man need fear no more to be cast into a lake of fire when he is dead than to be cast on a bed of down.

These solemn warnings were addressed to men living in the days of our Lord's first advent, THEY were taught to fear this dreadful doom of being cast into a furnace, or lake of fire where there will be "wailing and gnashing of teeth."

I fully accord with you that no judgment of investigation is necessary to enlighten the omniscient Jehovah concerning the actions or characters of men; but this is no proof that the divine wisdom may not institute a declaratory process concerning "the deeds done in the body," that God's righteousness in judgment may be made manifest to an intelligent universe. This principle is clearly recognized in the inspired account of the judgment at the coming of our Lord, Matt. 25th chapter. If this refers exclusively to those who are alive at his coming, it appears to me to present *the principles* on which all final judgment of men will proceed. These principles clearly involve the consciousness of those who are judged.

Rejoicing in the anticipation of seeing eye to eye "when that which is perfect is come," I am, dear brother, as ever, yours in christian love,

HENRY GREW.

Philadelphia, January 20th, 1856.

Response to H. Grew.

That there will be a "judgment both of a *judicial* and *executive* character," of all men, we have no doubt, nor have we questioned it in anything we have said; but that this will take place *after* all the dead are made *alive* again we are not prepared to admit; nor do we see anything our brother has adduced that satisfies our judgment of such a procedure. We are not convinced that any dead sinner "will be made *alive* by a resurrection (to) condemnation." We are not left to *infer* that those who are to be immortal will be so; though there would be much more ground for such infer-

ence than there is for any being mortal after being made alive from the dead. The righteous are said to have "eternal life": then, they will be *immortal*, is a fair inference; but inspiration has confirmed the fact by "*distinctly*" announcing that they "put on immortality" at the resurrection. Now, harmony, and definiteness, would seem to require, "*if* the impenitent and unbelieving are raised to *life* at all," it should be as distinctly announced that they are *mortal*. But nothing of the kind occurs in the Bible; and it is only by *inference*, based upon our brother's view of the meaning of certain texts, that the resurrection to *mortality* is to be established, if done at all. "The Saviour" no where states that anybody that is "made *alive* by a resurrection *at the last day*" is "mortal," or that they "will die the second death." He "*distinctly*" teaches the contrary, we think. The text John 5 : 28, 29 we do not "conceive" to teach any such doctrine: see our last remarks on this text in reply to "*Correction*," page 44.

We have so often responded to Br. G.'s quotation of Math. 10 : 28, and Lk. 12 : 5 that we feel a delicacy in pressing the subject; yet as he seems to think those texts an important confirmation of the affirmative, and now tells us "A man need fear no more to be cast into a lake of fire when he is dead than to be cast on a bed of down," we will try to see if Br. G. does not subjest his own view to the same apparent inconsistency. What does the text Lk. 12 : 5 say? "Fear Him who after *He hath killed* hath power to cast into *gehenna*." Now, is it not when the man "*is dead*" that God casts him into gehenna? Or, "after He [God] hath *killed*" a man is he still *alive*? We might say, then, to our brother, according to his own favorite text, the man "is dead" *before* he is "cast into gehenna," and will be no more *hurt* by it "than to be cast into a bed of down."

Usually nothing was cast into the literal gehenna that had life. But whatever was the state it was in, at the time, it was so dissolved that its reconstruction was impossible: hence to cast into gehenna became a figure of speech to denote destruction without recovery. Jesus taught his "*friends*" not to fear men who might deprive them of the present life but could not prevent their living again—*men* could not cast them into gehenna; or prevent their reorganization; but God could, for He only had that power: therefore, fear Him and not men. The *fear* commanded was to be exercised *now*, not *after* death: and the fear was that God would so fix the seal of death upon them that they should not live again—*i. e.*, seal their disorganization so that a future life would be impossible. Men could not do this, but God could; therefore "my friends," fear not men but God. "These solemn warnings were addressed to" Christ's "friends," and to them alone; see Lk. 12 : 4; and that to preserve them from apostatizing under their persecutions from men. The fear of not attaining to the *resurrection life*, that Christ promised to give his followers "at the last day," is *the fear* inculcated in Math. 10 : 28 and Lk. 12 : 5. Of this fact we have *no* "*doubt*": and it relates not to a fear to be realized after death, but in the present time and life.

That the living wicked, who remain unto the coming of the Lord, will be "cast into a furnace or lake of fire where there will be 'wailing and gnashing of teeth'" we do not question, any more than we question the fact that the living wicked were submerged in a lake, or flood of water in Noah's day, and that "there was weeping and gnashing of teeth." *That* was "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men"; but none were the actual partakers of that lake of water but the then living wicked, whom Peter calls "*the world* of the ungodly"; and he says, "The world that *then was* perished"; and he adds, "The heavens and the earth which are now by" [or according to] "the same word" [or, testimony of God] "are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of" [these] "ungodly men," of whom he had spoken in the previous verses, *viz*, the "scoffers" of "*the last* days," who scoffingly inquired, "Where is the promise of his coming?" and who, despising the idea of Christ's return from heaven would, at that time, be "walking after their own lust." These will meet with an awful perdition or destruction by the fire of that day, as the sinners of the old world did by water in the days of Noah.

Such we regard as the true teaching of Peter, and he never utters one word, in all he saith, of the ungodly, who are dead, being made *alive*, to come under the fire of that day; but he does state that God "is long suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish"; and that "He knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation," or trial, as Noah, Lot, and others were, while the wicked should not be suffered to escape, as "they escaped not" who mocked in Noah's and Lot's days; for while God delivers His faithful people His knowledge is fully equal to His power to reserve the unjust to the day of judgment to be punished; and the day of judgment spoken of is that

judgment in which God executes whatever he has threatened to those living in any age, or under any particular dispensation. This *punishment*, Peter saith, came on the old world of the ungodly and on Sodom; and that it will come especially on those worst of all sinners—the scoffers of the last days. They may think to escape, but God by the judgments on Sodom and the old world has shown that he knows how to reserve them to the day of their judgment to be punished. They may scoff when the "promise of his coming" is declared, but they shall know, as certainly as the ungodly world of old were made to know, that "God is not mocked," though He "is long-suffering"; for "the day will come as a thief in the night, in the which" these ungodly scoffers will find God's word is no more to be trifled with now than in the days of Noah, or of Lot. But whom does all this concern? We answer, in our *opinion*, and from the best judgment we can form from the word of truth, it concerns the ungodly of "the last days," who are alive at the time: and has nothing to do with the ungodly dead, except as it seals their doom to eternal night and death.

To remove our "*doubts*" of the revival into *life* of the wicked dead, we must see argument more potent than any we have yet seen. In other words, the evidence on the affirmative, of the questions involved in this discussion, must be more clear to our understanding before we can believe the coming of Jesus Christ into this world was to bring the greatest *curse* upon a large portion of Adam's posterity that it is possible to conceive, short of eternal sin and suffering. And it may well be a matter of doubt, if the affirmative has the truth, if Adam the *second* did not entail a heavier curse, on a very large part of men, than Adam the *first*. But "God *so loved* the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should *not perish* but have *everlasting life*." No other *life* comes by the Son of God. So the word of truth seems to teach us.

From F. A. Rew, Wayne Co., N. Y.

Dear Brother.—I have read your "BIBLE EXAMINER" for the past year with *interest* and *instruction;* and have got others to read it, which has produced conviction upon a few good minds, so that they begin to see the increasing darkness overspreading Gentile christendom, and the many fables producing great blindness, and the great danger into which the Church and world are brought by the bigoted ignorance of the "false teachers" of these "last days." You understand God's word *too well*, to be surprised at the trials through which those who cling to God's word, in truth are brought, when especially you consider the age in which we live, and the desperate wickedness into which the world *must* be brought to become vessels of wrath fitted for *destruction*.

In every age, in the past, God's true people have been the forsaken and persecuted few, and are we to be more favored than they? Space would fail me to mention "the great cloud of witnesses," but we see this fact developed, they are among the ones who alone have the promise of eternal life.

I like to read discussions when they are conducted with a proper spirit. It is a good way to obtain light, and without them we should not have been where we are, and been able to see the signs of the times, betokening so plainly the near approach of the kingdom of God, and the Christian's great reward. The sufferings of this present time are not to be thought of, when contrasted with the things to be revealed and enjoyed by those who endure to the end. God has always employed men as instruments to make known his purposes to the world, and upon their acceptance or rejection of *His truth* depends their *justification* or condemnation in the day of the Lord Jesus. We ought to be thankful that God has, in this age, raised up some *noble minds*, able to investigate, and willing to defend His word; and there are ever men fitted for the emergency; and they cannot say more than Paul did, that "bonds and afflictions abide me." In consideration of the foregoing I am not yet prepared to bid you "Farewell."

From Corsina Wood, Potter Co., Pa.

Br. Storrs.—It is a little more than two years since I first embraced the doctrine of no immortality nor endless life except through Jesus Christ alone; it was by reading your Six Sermons that I was led to search the scriptures on that important subject. Believe me when I tell you, that I was very much surprised to find the Bible taught no such doctrine as our being immortal in this life, but must seek for immortality if we ever have it. Truly, I thought it to be one of the most prominent teachings of the Bible: not because I had read it in the scriptures, but because I had so often heard it declaimed from the pulpit; and like too many others believed all the preachers said to be true. O how thankful I am, that I ever was led to read the Bible for myself. I now see a beauty in the scriptures that I never saw until of late. I would, if it were the will of God, that all others should go and do likewise; and not put so much confidence in popular theology. That teaches that the saints go to heaven at death; the Bible teaches the saints shall inherit the earth: that teaches the wicked will be kept alive in endless misery; the Bible teaches that all the wicked will God destroy: that teaches the dead know more than the living; the Bible teaches that the dead know not anything.

O! let us adhere to the teachings of the Bible in preference to all things else.

Yours in the hope of immortality at the revelation of our Saviour from heaven.

From Joseph W. Merrill, Boston.

Br. Storrs.—May the Lord bless your for you labor to spread the truth of the gospel as it is in Jesus Christ, of that salvation which shall be brought unto us at his appearing and kingdom. May the Lord grant you strength for the time to come, that you may show yourself a workman that needeth not to be reproved, rightly dividing the word of the Lord and giving to each his portion in due season.

I have to thank the Lord for the light which I have received through your paper, on the subject of the soul's immortality. Now all is plain.—Without *life from the dead* there can be no enjoyment of the promise made to the fathers. For he said, not unto thee and thy seeds, as of many; but unto *thee*, and *thy seed which is Christ*. So that it being by grace it is made sure to all of us, if so be that we are Christ's. Oh, may we do his will; that we may be found of him in peace at his appearing and *Kingdom*. So, Brother, labor on, and may the Lord bless you; amen.

"Six Sermons," *Revised and Enlarged.*—Those who have read this work, have found very much matter not in the *Original;* besides an entire new sermon on "*Christ, the Life-Giver.*" In addition to this, it is printed with a large, clear type, thus affording much more satisfaction in reading. *Price* in plain binding, 63 cents: in gilt $1.

The *Original* Six Sermons are out of print, and we have not a copy left; probably no more of them will be issued. We will put *eight* copies of the *Revised* at $3, for cash. We are of opinion that this work is vastly more valuable to circulate than the *Original.*

Dobney Abridged.—This is part 2d of Dobney's work on "Future Punishment," and contains his *entire* argument on the *nature* of that punishment; showing it to be literal *death*, and not endless torment. We have printed a few, and put them up in paper covers, which we offer as a *premium* to subscribers for the Examiner who pay $2. If any wish to purchase them, the price is 38 cents. By the quantity, we put *five* copies for $1, cash.

"Bible *vs.* Tradition,"—This invaluable work should have a wider circulation. Price 75 cents, bound; 50 cents in paper covers. By the dozen, bound, $5: in paper covers, *ten* copies for $3, cash.

For any of the foregoing works, when the *retail* price is sent, we will send them free of postage. When ordered by the quantity, the purchaser pays the freight, or postage, himself.

At these prices why should thousands not be circulated? We have no funds to send out works on commission or credit, and we must do our work *for cash*, or it must go undone. We have done all we can on the *credit* system: and we have now put the works extremely low to induce all to buy for cash. Such purchases are for their own benefit, whether they buy to sell or give away. Money for *books*, at wholesale price, must be sent at the purchaser's *risk*. *Address* in all cases, "Geo. Storrs, *Editor Bible Examiner, New.York.*"

"Take no thought for your life" what ye shall eat. &c. Can this mean that Christians are to be utterly regardless of making provision for themselves and families? Must they provide no clothing because God "clothes the grass of the field?" Must they neither sow, nor reap, because the birds are fed without storehouse or barn? Our Lord certainly meant no such thing! He only meant to chide that unreasonable anxiety which grows out of an overestimate of worldly good, and an underestimate of God's providence. He was inculcating a principle not prescribing practice.—*Ch. Ad.*

God made for some of the martyrs a prison sweet as a garden of flowers: what then will be heaven? If afflicting mercy be so great what will be crowning mercy?

James Battersby's *Post Office* Address is Fort Smith, Ark.

THE TIME OF REWARD.

"Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me."
Rev. 22: 12.

When did our Lord and Master
  Promise his own their reward?
When he cometh in glory,
  Speaks the unfailing record.

When in his *Father's* glory,
  With an angel train all bright,
A cloud his golden chariot,
  Encircled with the light.

The word declares 'tis quickly,
  He'll come to his own again;
Then by his quickening spirit,
  New life we shall attain.

He comes—he calls his faithful,
  All, out from among the dead;
And then the life-crown places,
  Upon every joyful head.

Soon they shall hear the plaudit,
  Blessed servant of mine, "well done;"
Then will ring the hallelujahs,
  Throughout that heavenly home.

The eye of sense ne'er beheld,
  Nor the heart of man conceived,
The joys God hath prepared,
  For those who have believed.

M. C. A.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1856. NO. 4.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 141 Fulton-street.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

The Resurrection of the Dead opposed to the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul.

(Continued from page 21.)

ESSAY VII.

"If the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain: ye are yet in your sins; THEN THEY ALSO WHICH ARE FALLEN ASLEEP IN CHRIST ARE PERISHED."—1 Cor. xv. 17, 18, 19.

In our first Essay upon this subject, we proposed to establish the positions "that the resurrection from the dead is *peculiarly* the doctrine of the gospel," and that the hypothesis of an immaterial, immortal soul, is a "doctrine of heathenism and infidelity, and essentially opposed to the christian's hopes of futurity:" this design has been carried into effect, by historically tracing immaterialism up to an origin purely heathen; —by proving that man is entirely material, and that his physical and mental powers are produced by organization; —by explaining all the scriptural terms connected with this subject, and deducing therefrom direct evidence in disproof of immaterialism:—by examining every passage in both the Old and New Testament, which our opponents have advanced, and proving that such passages do not answer the object for which they were adduced—and by shewing, that from the period of death, to that of a resurrection, there is no recognition in the scriptures of an intermediate state of consciousness, and that, consequently, there is no evidence that the future existence of man will commence until the period of the resurrection.

Having effected thus much in the controversy, we now proceed briefly to notice the leading and important place which the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead occupies in divine revelation; and such being admitted, the doctrine of the materiality of man follows as an inseparable consequence, for as has been briefly and clearly stated, 'death and resurrection are terms opposed to each other: a real resurrection must be preceded by the actual death of that which is raised; that which does not die, cannot be raised *from* the dead; the resurrection made known in the Scriptures is a resurrection from the dead; whatever is to be raised from the dead, must remain dead, until it is raised." This view of future existence will be seen directly to emanate from the declarations of Jesus, as well as from the teachings of his apostles, it having been announced that "this is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life, and *I will raise him up at the last day*," John vi. 40; and those who from right principles could give entertainment to others, are told to "call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, and thou shalt be blessed, for they cannot recompense thee —thou shalt be recompensed *at the resurrection of the just*." Luke xiv. 13, 14. Thus "the will of him" who sent the Messiah was to make known to his creatures, "everlasting life;" a life from the very terms of the communication, clearly not derivable from a self-existent, immortal principle, but, from the "resurrection from the dead." It was for proclaiming this doctrine, and that too in defiance of both Jewish and heathen authorities, and even of martyrdom itself, on the part of the apostles, that the "priests and the captains of the temple and the Sadducees came upon them; being grieved that they taught the people and preached through Jesus"—not the immortality of the soul, —but "the *Resurrection from the dead*." (Acts iv. 1, 2.)

The hope of a future state of existence, built upon this foundation, rests not on the belief of an immortal spirit, but solely, and to the *exclusion* of all other doctrines, on the declarations of the Messiah, and the fact that God had raised the man Jesus from the dead: for "if there be no resurrection of the dead, (*no future life*) then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith also vain, yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not." (1 Cor. xv. 14, 15, 16.) So that from the reasoning of Paul it is clear to demonstration, that if our future existence depend on our being animated by an immaterial spirit, the apostle was not favored with the knowledge of so convenient a passport to immortality, and was therefore deprived of a most easy and infallible mode of silencing all gainsayers; for of what avail to the argument in support of a future state of existence could be the resurrection of Jesus, providing the doctrine of immaterialism were true; as, in that case, whether he were raised from the dead, or whether he were not raisod, immortality was alike ensured to *every* man, and that too, upon the shewing of our opponents, independent even of the power of God! but the apostle Paul, as if possessed of a foreknowledge of the perversions which the doctrine of a future state was destined to undergo, has put upon record

such views upon this subject, as cannot fail to explode every fallacious theory: thus, the Thessalonians are told "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, as others which have no hope: *for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again*, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him, wherefore comfort one another with these words." (1 Thess. iv. 13, 14, 18.) Upon the supposition of all being animated by an immortal principle, how or why, we would ask, should the apostle, when expressly treating of a future state, and the hopes consequent upon its belief, have omitted all reference thereto? and upon the same hypothesis, why should the Thessalonians "sorrow?"—why should they have "no hope?" for whether Jesus had "risen again" or not, that fact could neither retard nor accelerate the future life of immortal souls—but in addition, this same apostle concludes one division of his argument to the Corinthians, with a remark which forever should put this question beyond all controversy; for, "if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, you are yet in your sins; then they also *which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished!!!* If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." (1 Cor. xv. 17, 18, 19.) Here we close with the immaterialist, and maintain that as an immortal soul cannot perish, he must either renounce his system, or renounce Paul: for the latter unequivocally asserts, (and indeed his argument can have no weight, except upon its admission) the complete mortality of the entire man, who, when he has "fallen asleep," cannot have hopes of again existing, but by means of a resurrection from the dead; the evidence for which was made to rest, not upon an inherent immortality, but upon the fact that Jesus, a man like ourselves, had been raised from the dead: for, "if there be no resurrection from the dead, then is Christ not risen;" and in the emphatic language of the apostle to the Jews—"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ* from the dead to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you." (1 Peter, i. 3, 4.)

THE FORM AND MANNER OF THE RESURRECTION has long been a subject of considerable disputation; and the defenders of immaterialism have labored to make their system accord with the scriptures, by asserting that the *same* identical flesh and blood from which the soul took its departure at death, will be again animated by the *same soul*, and thereby enjoy immortality, although Paul has announced that we "*shall be changed;*" "*that corruption cannot inherit incorruption,*" and that we shall be "*raised incorruptible.*" On the other hand the enemies of revelation have not failed to avail themselves of this theory, and have well argued the difficulties with which it is attended: thus "the same piece of matter may happen to be a part of two or more bodies, as a fish feeding on a man, and another man afterwards feeding on the fish, part of the body of the first man becomes incorporated with the fish, and afterwards in the fish with the last man; instances have been known of one man feeding upon another, and where the substance of one man is converted into the substance of another, such cannot rise with his whole body, and to which shall the part in common belong?" (See Rees's Cyclo. Vol. XXX.)

Whatever force these objections may have, they are only applicable to those who maintain the resurrection of the *same body*, and will be found to fall perfectly harmless, when applied to the scriptural doctrine of a future life, for, as Locke has ably observed in his reply to the Bishop of Worcester, "In the New Testament, I find, our Savior and the apostles preach the resurrection *of the dead* and the resurrection *from the dead*; but I do not remember any place where the resurrection of the *same body* is so much as mentioned; nay, which is very remarkable in the case, I do not remember in any place of the New Testament, where the general resurrection at the last day is spoken of, any such expression as the resurrection of the body." In addition to the reasoning of Locke we would observe, that the *same* flesh and blood—*the same* particles of matter—cannot be raised in the same person, nor are they essential to constitute the *same man*. *Conscious identity* being the only criterion, by means of which the unity, or sameness of any given individual can be preserved; and that too even in the present life, (without at all referring to the decomposition the dead body rapidly undergoes) for in the living person "the human body is continually changing; a man has not entirely the same body to-day as he had yesterday; and it is even computed, that in less than seven years time, the whole human body undergoes a change, *and not a particle of the same body remains.*" (Rees's Cyclo. Vol. XXX., article Resurrection.)

A future life is, therefore, not a reanimation of the *same* particles of matter, but a revival of the consciousness of prior existence; and in such revived consciousness will consist the resurrection or the re-living of mankind: and while upon this branch of our subject we would remark, that should the use of the term "resurrection," occasion any difficulty, it would be well in any such cases to substitute the words "future life," such being in every instance the sense in which it is used: a sense which, in the judgment of good critics, would be a more faithful rendering of the term in the original.

The *form* with which we shall rise from the dead, would seem of old, as well as in modern times, to have been urged as an objection to a future life; and in the instance of the unbelievers in the Corinthian church, Paul at once states and meets this supposed difficulty. "But some man will say, *how* will the dead be raised up, and with *what body* do they come? Thou fool! that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die, and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain; but God giveth it a body as it pleaseth him, and to every seed its own body." (1 Cor. xv. 35 to 37.)

From this familiar illustration of the apostle, much misconception has arisen: chiefly, however,

from a mistaken idea, that it was designed by him as a complete exposition of the doctrine of a future life; when in fact it is advanced, not for the purpose of proving the resurrection at all, but to answer an inquiry, "*with what body we should come*" when rising from the dead; which objection the writer treats with merited indifference, as being of no importance, seeing that God giveth to all parts of creation, whether animate or inanimate, "*whatsoever body it pleaseth him;*" and, to all, those bodies which are best suited to the purposes for which he had designed them: still one class of objectors, among whom Mr. Paine ranks pre-eminent, thinks fit thus to condemn the reasoning of the apostle: "Sometimes Paul affects to be a naturalist, and to prove his system of resurrection from the principles of vegetation; but the metaphor, in this point of view, is no simile,—it is succession not resurrection:—the progress of an animal from one state of being to another, as from a worm to a butterfly, applies to the case; but this of a grain does not, and shews Paul to have been what he says of others—a fool." (Age of Reason, Part II. p. 85. Carlile's 8vo. Edit. 1819.) An attention, however, to the remarks of Paul would have shewn Mr. Paine, that it is not to "prove his system of resurrection" that he illustrates his idea by seed sown in the ground; that branch of his argument having been brought to a conclusion in the preceding verses, in which he "proves his system," not from "affecting to be a naturalist," but from the admitted fact of the resurrection of the Messiah, and the promises consequent upon that event, and that, without at all going into the question, as to *how*, and in what manner the designs of God upon that subject should be carried into effect; though in fact, had Paul used the simile of the seed with the object stated by Mr. Paine, his reasoning would not have merited the comments which it has received: for as Dr. Priestley has remarked, "the comparison is not supposed to apply throughout, as if the Apostle intended to say, that by a law of nature, similar to that of the re-production of seeds from seeds, a dead man should produce a living one, for the cases are remarkably different, there being an apparent living principle or germ, the expansion of which makes the future plant; so that if the whole seed should ever become putrid, no other plant or seed could be produced from it; but as antecedent to experience, we could not have known this, but should rather have imagined, that a seed buried in the ground would be absolutely lost: so notwithstanding appearances to the contrary, with respect to man, though he be buried, the time may come when he will appear again." (Priestley's Notes on the Bible, Vol. IV. p. 160.)

But had Paul's knowledge of natural history equalled that of *even* the author of the "Age of Reason," and had he attempted, as Mr. Paine states he might have done, to prove "his system of resurrection," by "the progress of an animal from one state of being to another, as from a worm to a butterfly," then indeed his reasoning might have been impeached, for in the instance of seed sown in the earth, there *is* an apparent extinction of life; but in Mr. Paine's amended case, there is neither a real, nor an apparent extinction; for the worm in becoming a butterfly, merely undergoes a change of form whilst in the full possession of life and vigor. Had the apostle thus argued the doctrine of the resurrection, and had he been so imbecile a reasoner as to "apply to his case," an instance, which if it proved anything, would prove the negative of his own position; then, indeed, he might well have been arraigned for his folly. The simile used by Paul, it will be seen, was not to prove the resurrection, but simply to meet the question, as to our *form* in a future state; and he further proceeds, in support of his familiar illustration, to maintain, that "*God giveth what form it pleaseth him,*" as instanced in the evidence of Almighty power; that power, the magnitude and infinity of which was equally developed in the minute, as well as in the vast in creation; and in all there was an evidence of the *fitness* of every form *to* the circumstances, and *for* the purposes for which it was created, as demonstrated in the production of the fruits of the earth—in the formation of beasts—of birds—of fishes—of men—of bodies terrestial and celestial—in the glory of the sun—of the moon—of the stars—and, "as one star differeth from another star in glory, so also is the resurrection of the dead: it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown an animal body, it is raised a spiritual body; for there is an animal* body, and there is a spiritual body." (41, 43.) Paul, (says Locke) means to shew, "that as we have now animal bodies, which, unless supported by a constant supply of air, will fail and perish, and at last, do what we can, will dissolve, and come to an end, so that at the resurrection we shall have bodies which shall have an essential, natural, and inseparable life in them;" that life, we would further remark, which is promised by Jesus to those "which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead; for neither can they die any more, for they are equal to the angels, (messengers) and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." (Luke xx. 35, 36.)

Thus the argument pursued by Paul, to convince those of the Corinthian church who were unbelievers in a future state, is of great importance; as we have seen' that whilst he could have no conception of the theories of the immaterialists, yet, had his argument been expressly shaped for the purpose of overthrowing such doctrines, it could not have been more successful; and while the *certainty* of that state is maintained, some of the particulars which will be characteristic of it, are also treated upon for the evident purpose of giving a connected view of the entire subject; for "*now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept,*" verse 20; the first fruits in the Mosaic law, (Lev. xxiii. 10) being the first ripe corn gath-

* The received text reads, "*it is sown a* NATURAL *body,*" which tends to mislead the reader. Our adoption of the above rendering is supported by numerous authorities. See Macknight, Belsham, and Locke; the latter of whom states, that the term "translated in the Bible *a natural body*, should be translated *an animal body.*"

ered before the rest, such being the earnest and pledge of the future harvest; a figure, as applied to a future state of existence, illustrative of the situation occupied by Jesus, relatively towards others. "But every man in his own order, Christ, the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's, at his coming; then will the end be, when God the Father delivereth up the kingdom to him: when he (God) shall have put down all rule, all authority and power, for he (God) must reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet; the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, and when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him,* that God may be all in all." (See verses 24 to 28.)

THE ORDER OF THE RESURRECTION, as thus stated by Paul, has given rise to much diversity of opinion: some maintaining that it is a relation of the several classes of mankind, which are all to rise at the general resurrection; others that it is a statement of—first, the resurrection of Jesus; second, the resurrection of the virtuous; third, that of the wicked, who, after having passed through the necessary state of discipline, shall be made virtuous and happy; and others esteem the verses from the 23rd to the 29th, inclusive, to be descriptive of three distinct and distant periods: Firstly, the resurrection of Jesus: secondly, that of his devoted servants in every age, who, because of their obedience to the principles of the gospel, would be rewarded by being raised prior to the general resurrection; such being supposed to be those spoken of in the Revelations, as "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, for on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God, and of Christ," Rev. xx. 6; a period of time, considered to be referred to by Paul in the Thessalonians, when the "Lord himself shall descend, and the dead in Christ shall rise first," (1 Thess. iv. 16) as a reward to such persons on the one hand, and on the other for the purpose of placing them in a situation to assist in the establishment of that state of things, in which God shall be *"all in all."* We have deemed it well thus to submit these several modes of explaining a passage in the writings of the apostle of acknowledged difficulty; remarking, however, at the same time, that be the correct one which it may, our immediate argument against the immaterialists, will receive full and equal support, seeing that in each it is the "resurrection of *the man*" from the dead," not the possession of an immortal spirit, which was made the ground of a future state of existence; and in perfect conformity with this view, are the finishing statements of the apostle, in which it is palpable, that an immaterial, immortal principle is not only not recognized by him, but that its admission would entirely destroy his argument. "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed; *for the dead shall be raised* incorruptible, (*not the immortal souls*) and we shall be changed; for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory." Need we here point out that that which is immaterial, cannot be corruptible, that that which is immortal can neither be called upon *"to put on"* immortality, nor can it become mortal; that the future existence of a being inherently immortal, could neither be "a *mystery*," nor *"a victory,"* neither could it excite unexpected exultation: and the grand climax of the apostle, *"O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?"* would have been a satire upon the understanding of those to whom he wrote, and could not have failed to have furnished his enemies with a triumphant weapon against himself; for as Arch-deacon Blackburn has shewn, "of what consequence is it if they have immortal life by nature, whether they have it by promise or not? what does it signify whether they have hopes of a resurrection or not, if they are sure of a future life by provision, and allotment *without* a resurrection?" (Blackburn's Works, vol. iii. page 195.)

Having now brought to a close our scriptural remarks, we would just glance at an assertion which has been made by writers, whose sentiments in other particulars are much opposed to each other; namely, that a future state of existence is

* In the adoption of the above translation, we have widely departed from the received text; our reasons for so doing are, that, whilst the common translation has given rise to the most opposing theories, it fails to convey to the mind any clear and connected view of the apostle's argument: this will be more clearly seen by comparing the 24th and 28th verses. In the former, "HE" that is to *"put down all rule, authority, and power"* is Jesus. In the latter, "HE" that is to *"put all things under him"* is God. In the 24th verse, when the *"end"* cometh, Jesus is to deliver up the kingdom to God. Now *"the kingdom"* (i. e. the church *of* God) is the kingdom or church *of* God—not the kingdom or church of Jesus; consequently Jesus could not *"deliver"* that up which was not his to deliver. To make the 25th verse accord with the common translation of the 24th, a new feature is appropriated to the Messiah's office: that of making him reign *"until* HE *hath put all enemies under* HIS *feet,"* when of him the declaration of the Supreme Being is, "Sit thou on my right hand, until *I* make thine enemies thy footstool." See Pslam cx. Matthew xxii. 43. Acts ii. 34. Throughout the scriptures, the *punishment* of the enemies of truth proceeds *directly* from the Deity alone, whose benevolence is, in an equal degree shown, whether in punishing or in rewarding and exalting; and in relation to whom, when he hath put all enemies under his feet, he will then, when that is effected, deliver *"the kingdom"* to his son, when "God shall be all in all," by the universal spread of the principles of the gospel. The authority in support of the translation which we adopt, is that of Gilbert Wakefield, who, instead of *"Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the father,"* renders the passage *"Then will the end be when God the father delivereth up the kingdom to him"* (Jesus;) and this translation of Mr. Wakefield's is founded upon the Ethiopic version, which, in our judgment, clears up the difficulties which most commentators have attached to these verses; and which Mr. Belsham, Vol. ii. 338, has said that "nothing perhaps but the great event can fully explain."

not a doctrine *peculiar* to Christianity. In support of this position, Mr. Sturch, in an equivocal chapter on a future state, asserts, "as a future state was *certainly known* to both the Jewish and Heathen world, then what becomes of what has been termed the peculiar doctrine of the gospel?" To which we have simply to remark, that the future state said to be *known* to the Heathen world, was one of merely wild theory, the views of which varied not only in every heathen nation, but also, in that of the teachings of almost every eminent individual in those nations, and that the whole was built upon the presumed existence of an immaterial immortal principle in man; but the scriptural doctrine of a future life, by means of a resurrection from the dead, and founded upon the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, a man like ourselves, (to appreciate which doctrine the *materiality* and consequent *mortality* of the entire man is indispensable,) can be proved most triumphantly to be a doctrine "*peculiarly*" of the gospel—a doctrine which the wise and the great among the heathen could not even comprehend; for when they heard of Jesus, and of the resurrection, they supposed them to be strange gods; "and when they (the Athenian philosophers) heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked, and others said, we will hear you again of this matter." (Acts xxxii.) A still more recent, and a much abler writer than the one just quoted, thinks fit to represent as being one and the same system—the doctrine of an immortal soul, and that of the resurrection from the dead; for "the immortality of the soul, and a future state of rewards and punishments were fully recognized in ALL the religions of the ancient world, *except* the Jewish, and they are equally so in those of more modern times." (Lawrence's Lectures, p. 8.) An opposite theory to that of Mr. Lawrence, in regard to the Jews, has been maintained by some Jewish as well as Christian writers: among the former Ben Levi thinks "it necessary to take notice of the falsity of what Christians in general maintain; viz. —that the Jews were unacquainted with the doctrine of the resurrection." This writer, however, commits that doctrine in *two* ways: *firstly*, By falling in with the heathen hypothesis of an immortal soul, which has been proved to be absurd and unphilosophical; and *secondly*, by contending that the resurrection will be that of *the same* body, which also has been shewn to be impossible, and both proved to be alike unscriptural.

It would, however, seem to be the fact, that in the latter period of the Jewish history, some sects among that people had imbibed, doubtless from their intercourse with the heathen nations, the notion of an immortal principle; but it may be most safely asserted, that *as a nation*, they had not that which, upon such a subject, can be the *only* authority for believing that we shall live again; namely, the authority of Revelation. The rewards promised to them, and the punishments threatened, were all of a temporal character, nor did the knowledge of a future life form any part of the Mosaic economy; but, considering that Judaism and Christianity are really but parts of one system, it is highly probable that the prophets and other eminently enlightened and virtuous men of the Jewish nation, were led to infer, from what they *did know* of the dispensations of God, that the present would not be the only state of our existence; and such an idea would receive support from the fact of Enoch and Elijah not having seen death, as well as from many exalted passages in the prophetic writings descriptive of the character and attributes of the Divine Being. Still this must have been but conjecture, on their parts, and can, in relation to their sentiments, be but conjecture on ours; but this we do know, that "Jesus the Christ *hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.*"—2 Tim. i. 8, &c. Such life and such immortality is indeed a doctrine peculiar to the gospel—a doctrine which without an express revelation, man never could have placed confident hopes in; and we may safely assert, that the doctrine of the resurrection was not communicated to mankind before the proclamation of that gospel, of which it forms a leading and a vital part; that being one of "the great truths of religion, and one of the fundamental principles of morals," it exactly possesses the recommendation which a writer before quoted, deems essential to the reception of such truths; "for Revelation alone is capable of dissipating the uncertainties which perplex those who inquire into the sources of these important principles." (Lawrence's Lectures, p. 12.) So we say, and so we believe: but we maintain, that Revelation *has* dissipated these uncertainties, though it would seem to but little purpose in the instance of one who can be so utterly ignorant of what it has taught, as to confound the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the dead with the "sublime doctrine of all ages;" (i. e. the immortality of the soul) and then jeer at Revelation —not for what it does teach, but what, from his own ignorance of the subject, he deems fit to attribute thereto. That it is a doctrine which secures the object of future existence, without being incumbered with the palpable absurdities, and philosophical puzzles of the system of the immortality of the soul;—that it comports with the most enlightened reason, and the deepest philosophical and physiological research, and connected as it is with the nature, and fitted to secure the object of the Christian religion, it is, when justly appreciated, capable of supplying the most powerful motives, for perfecting the character, and insuring the happiness of man, as well in the present as in the future state of existence.

With this estimate of the scriptural doctrine of a future state, we cannot but reprobate the hypothesis of an immaterial and immortal soul, the belief of which, being opposed to revelation, and tending to the destruction of a most valuable part of Christianity, has supplied the unbeliever with some of his most potent arguments against that system; and to such supporters of revelation, who may from old prejudices, still adhere to the heathen hypothesis, we shall conclude by quoting the well-expressed advice of Bishop Law. "If you have hurt your own cause, and corrupted Christianity by an impure mixture of human wisdom, falsely so called, or by the dregs of heathen philosophy; if you have disguised the face of it, or rather substituted something else in its room, and thereby put arms into the hands of infidels, which they have used but

too successfully against us: I ask whether it is not high time to examine our Bibles, and try to exhibit the true Christian plan as it is there delivered, and consider whether we may not surely rest upon that solid rock of a resurrection, without any of those visionary prospects which imagination is ever ready to furnish us with: whether by this means we might not be able to move the seat of war into the enemy's quarters, till at length he sees *the necessity for some superior guide, and sets himself in good earnest to seek after that light which came down from above, and which alone can lead him to the light of everlasting life?*"

NEW YORK CENTRAL COLLEGE.

IMMORTALITY—THE SOUL.

FROM J. B. COOK.

Man made in God's image.

THE subject embraced in these terms, was investigated briefly, Sunday, Jan. 13, and the evening of Jan. 20th, in the chapel of New York Central College, McGrawville, Courtland Co.

The occasion was that bro. JESSE T. SHEPHERD made a donation to the College, on condition that freedom should be allowed, especially as to the introduction of the Bible view of Immortality, and the soul. At his invitation I went with him to McGrawville. The President, Mr. CALKINS, arranged matters agreeably, and according to expectation. His courtesy and Christian bearing we trust will ever be appreciated. The whole time on Lord's day was allotted us. Bro. Shepherd spoke in confirmation.

My first aim was to lay a foundation that they could occupy in common with us, and show that my object was not speculation, or controversy, but the proclamation of the gospel, with reference to the attainment of real and practical present good. This effort was successful, if we could judge from actions or subsequent plain words. But the plain statements of the Bible as to "the soul" and its need of "Immortality" through "Jesus of the Resurrection," (or transformation at the coming of Christ) seemed strange, startling, and to some revolting.

A leading man said "I have not examined this subject scarce at all, but I must look into it."—Many inquiries were made and answered so as apparently to satisfy the intellect, if not the heart, for the time.

The ex-President, Prof. C. P. GROSVENOR, on Monday, suggested that my statement of the subject was "not quite fair"—that in quoting Gen. 2: 7; 1 Cor. 15: 45, &c., I was not *full*—did not cover the ground, and hence was not correct in my conclusion! Man, he said, was made in the Divine image. This "Image" was thought to be something superior, diviner, and more enduring than the organized Adam—the first "living soul," Gen. 2: 7. This supposed celestial something—this "Image," was thought to encompass, and pervade the whole of our common humanity—and all of the Holy scriptures which relate to man and his destiny—whether righteous or wicked. The objection, I saw, was to him valid, and my conviction was, that if he should state it to the faculty and audience in College, it would, to *un*-established minds shut out all that had been quoted plainly from "the mouth of the Lord."

It was agreed that he should state his objection to the audience, and I respond.

My aim is to state the objection in all its strength. But still to avoid being tedious, I must group the Professor's points, as they appeared in my reply. He occupied *two* hours; not varying five minutes, more or less, though it was understood that he would occupy but "a few minutes." Then the chapel had become cold, and I was compelled to speak under these disadvantages—to a weary audience in a cold room! I trust it was partly from inadvertence—from a *mis*-conception of the obstacles to be overcome in the argument (on the part of the Professor, which kept him *trying to satisfy* even himself,) and from not fully appreciating the subject. Should another opportunity occur, I trust, that the President will guard against such an *appearance* of unfairness.

There had been previous notices of lectures to fill up considerable time, so I could not put off, and did not.

OUR REPLY.

We need not, like Prof. G., to frame up an argument. No. Our first and main business is to take God's *assertion* as to all the points embraced. We do argue; but God has spoken—plainly, repeatedly, and in varied forms of expression, so that the truth does not remain to be elaborated. It is *revealed!* "The true God" has spoken the *truth* in truthful words! Our first duty is, therefore, to believe these "words of *truth*." No argument is worth one straw, that does not rise *from* and take *in* these essential elements of truth, touching the soul, and the doctrine of immortality.

The first "soul" was "the first *man*," according to our Bible, Gen. 2: 7. The living "man, Adam," was the "living soul:" 1 Cor. 15: 45. On the day of Pentecost there were added to the church 3000 "SOULS." In this primary sense, the original word occurs about 500 times! A secondary use is admitted and taught, but it does not alter the primary and prevailing one. So definite is this application of the word to the being as a whole that it applies *five* times out of the first *six!* In Gen. 1: 20, 21, 24, 30; Gen. 2: 7, and 19. "*Living creatures*," &c., in our English Bible, is in Hebrew, "*Living souls.*"

Man's distinction lies in his superior organization, and his crowning position in the scale of created beings. It is not in the fact that the word "soul" is appropriated to him. The primary use of this term denotes the creature or the person. In eleven texts it applies to the *person* after DEATH! Num. 19: 11, Margin and Hebrew.

Man, the first "living soul," was made like all other creatures "under law"—on probation. The penalty of violating law was "death." This sentence of mortality has passed on the race, Rom. 5: 12; 6: 21–23. Paradise, and God's presence was lost.

The plan of *Redemption* provides instruction for the ignorant, pardon for the guilty, *life* for "the dead," and "Paradise" *restored!*

One is the counterpart of the other. Divine pro-

vision suits man's most pressing need. This harmony is the strongest confirmation that we do conceive aright of man's creation, and his present condition, and his need of a personal "redemption" by "Jesus and the Resurrection."

But if you personalize the "living soul" (living person) in his creation, or probation, you must also in his death and redemption;" for there must be coherency. It is all mystical, or all real. An allegory or a true history. Mystics make it mystical, but the Bible makes it real and historical. Shakers, Swedenborgians, "the Old Serpent," and all who deny man's *death*, are consistent in denying his revealed Resurrection! But the Bible makes man, the living soul, as personal as the world is real—his death as much relating to his selfhood as his life! And his personal "*Resurrection* from the dead" as certain as the Saviour's first or second Advent!

The Psalm sung at the Professor's suggestion this evening, affirms the popular opinion which he would enforce.

> "I'll praise my Maker with my breath;
> And when my voice is lost in death,
> Praise shall employ my nobler powers,
> While—Immortality endures"!

Let us read the part of this God-given "song of Zion," to which the Professor refers. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man;—his breath, (spirit,) goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth. In that *very day* his *thoughts perish*." Ps. 146. "Return, O Lord, deliver my soul; O, save me for thy mercy's sake, for *in death* there is no remembrance of thee! In the grave, who shall give thee thanks"! Ps. 6: 4, 5; 88: 11. "The *dead praise not* the Lord:" Ps. 115: 17; Is. 38: 18. Now is it well to sing before the Lord, a flat denial of all his word!

"*Thy word is truth*," says the Great Teacher, John 17: 17. My illustration of this, the Professor approves; nay, *commends* to this audience! This should settle the point with every logical mind; because the assertion of "the word" is, that man, as man, is "mortal"—only "mortal." His "*mortality*" is contrasted with Immortality to be obtained through grace, and at the Resurrection; 1 Cor. 15: 53, 54; Rom. 1: 23; Job 4: 17; 14: 10–15; 2 Cor. 5: 4–8. This is truth—*God's truth*.

"*Immortality*" is found five times in Holy Scripture. Once it is affirmed of God "*only*;" 1 Tim. 6: 16. Once it is an object of search—a motive to piety; Rom. 2: 7. Twice it is asserted of the saints in, and *by*, "the Resurrection;" 1 Cor. 15: 53, 54; and once Christ is said to have "abolished death and brought life and Immortality to light." He hath brought it out into light and made it plain! It is by revealing, exemplifying in his own person, and opening clear up, "the *way*" from mortality to Immortality, and bringing a future *life* to light! This is as decisive in argument as that God's word to us "*is truth*." The opposite assertion can not be found! nor the idea, except from inference or from that "wisdom" which "knows not God"!

MAN was made, as really as other creatures—"*a living soul*." God is his Creator in common—"The Father" alike of *all* their "spirits." Gen. 6: 17. "All flesh, in which is the *spirit* of life—shall *die*"; Gen. 7: 15–22; Num. 16: 22; 27: 16; Job 12: 10. "In whose hand is the *soul* of every living thing, and the *breath* of all mankind." Acts 17: 28; Job 34: 14–15; Eccl. 3: 18; 12: 7. All flesh have the words "breath," "*soul* and *spirit*" asserted of them; therefore these words do not assert the "Immortality" of man! Adam was on probation. Immortality to him was attainable only by obedience and partaking of "the tree of life." From this he was driven because of sin.—Now "a *new* way—to life and immortality" is opened by "Jesus and the Resurrection." "The Gospel of salvation" embraces just this.

Prof. G. availed himself reservedly of the adage that, "what every body says must be true."—Therefore man is not mortal!

Reply.—The multitude have been ignorant and wicked. Six hundred millions are still shrouded in heathenism. About three-fourths of Christendom are Papists: and but very few sustain the essential principle of the Gospel for the Africans of our land, as held by the Professor. If the multitude make the argument, then Elijah was wrong; because in number, Baal's priests had 849 majority! Prof. G. dwelt mainly on Gen. 1: 26, 27. This was indeed the base of his argument. He thought that there *must be* a distinction in the terms which describe man's creation, so as to separate this part of the Creator's work from other creatures—"Let us make Man in our own image after our likeness: and let them have dominion, &c. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them"! On these terms (the context and the introduction) he filled up an hour or more. But the sum and substance—the full weight and full worth I give—not all the words, of course; but the thought.

The word for "*create*" is *bara* (*a*, broad). It means, he said, to originate; call into being; as in v. 1, "In the beginning God *created* the heavens and the earth." "So God *created* man"—called him into being—in his "own *image* and likeness." Other creatures were *not* made in God's image!

"*Asah*, God *made* the firmament, v. 7; God *made* the beast, v. 25. He *asah-ed* the beast, &c., bara-ed the man!

"*Yatsar*" is the word used ch. 2: 7, "The Lord God *formed* man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living *soul*." These last two words, "*formed* and *made*," relate to the fashioning of various creatures and the human frame. But (*bara*) *create*, conveys an higher idea—it relates to man's origination in the likeness and image of his God!

Now he asked shall this *likeness* cease? No! This *immortal* "likeness" will endure forever.—This representation invests man with a peculiar relation to Divinity, and Immortality. No other creature whose creation is recorded in our Scriptures, sustains any such relation to the subject before us. (Of this argument I have made as much as possible.)

REPLY.—The distinction of terms, I admit, aside

from a few mistakes in their "orthoepy," or orthography. But the mere English reader may learn in five minutes that our version marks this distinction, so far as it exists, in the Hebrew. "Create" is from *bara*—"made" from *asah*, and "formed" from *yatsar*. "Create" occurs Gen. 1: 1, 21, 27, and 2: 3, 4, seven times. "Made" v. 7, 25, 26, 31; and ch. 2: 2, 3, 4, also seven times. *Yatsar*, "*formed*," is found *three* times, ch. 2: 7, 8, 19.

But note! *all* these *three* terms apply to the creation of man and not "*bara*" exclusively! Gen. 1: 25, 27; 2: 7.

Again, *all* these same three words apply to the creation of *beasts*; Gen. 1: 21, *bara*; verse 25 *asah*; ch. 2: 19, *yatsar*; therefore there is *no* foundation for his argument left!

Besides, if we use the Professor's phraseology, we must say that so far from God's having "*asah-ed* the beasts and *bara-ed* the man" (exclusively, or even distinctively), he *bara ed the beasts* on the 5th day. This was before he did man on the 6th! "God created (*baraed*) great whales, and (*baraed*) every living creature—living soul," Gen. 1: 21. Thus his foundation is all taken away.

"*Living soul*," as God "created," "made," or "formed" them, is affirmed *four* times of the various animated beings before it is applied to man: v. 20, 21, 24, 30. The English version does not allow this to appear to the unlearned (except as "*soul*" and "*living soul*" is placed in the margin v. 20 and 30.)

Of the *six* times that we first read of "*soul*" in Hebrew, it belongs *five* times to mere animals—and but *once* to *Man!* It applies to the *creature*, or the personality, about five or six hundred times out of about eight hundred. Nay, so fully does the soul apply to the organized being, that it is applied to "*the dead*" eleven times!

Thus all the Professor's argument, based on (*bara*) *create*, as well as on the word "*soul*," to sustain an objection against man's asserted mortality (and his need of Immortality through Jesus, and the Resurrection) oozes away from his supposed grasp at the first and least intelligent notice. Not a shadow so far remains of all his imposing argumentative array.

"THE IMAGE" in which man was made, may, however, contain something in favour of his imagined native immortality! Let us see. "What saith the Scriptures?" The man Adam, when outcast from Eden and the primal means of Immortality, (or living "forever," Gen. 3: 22,) "begat a son in his own *likeness* and after *his image*," Gen. 5: 3. The terms are so used as to decide their import. But so far as the "Image of God" was marred it has been restored in the 2d Adam "The *express* IMAGE of his person"; Heb. 1. He is "*the Son of God*—with power"—being so declared at his Resurrection from the dead."

In this divine "Image" the saints are to be restored—be "made *like* Him,"—renewed in *the image* of Him that "made" us.

[To be continued.]

HASTY ebullitions are often best met by silence, for the shame that follows the sober second thought pierces deeper than rebuke.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1856.

The Spirit of Christianity.

"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life." JESUS.

These words were the utterance of him who "spake as never man spake." They are worthy of deep consideration. No reflective mind will adopt a sentiment as the design and intention of a speaker whose known views do not harmonize with it, even though the *words* might bear such a construction. The general and known sentiments of the speaker must be taken into the account where his words might seem to convey a different meaning; and no construction must be given his words which contradicts his clearly known views.

Christianity has certain great principles which underlie its whole frame work. Any interpretation of the frame work which does not harmonize with these foundation principles must be a mistaken view of the words.

The first foundation principle of Christianity is "*God is love.*" This principle underlies all his dealings with men, as revealed in the gospel; and hence it is added—"He that dwelleth *in love* dwelleth in God and God in him." This principle, then, is to regulate all our actions towards our fellow creatures, as it regulates all the administration of God towards the works of His hands. Nothing is to be attributed to God, as His *direct* action relative to His creatures, that is not in harmony with the divine principle of love begotten in us by the gospel, or which is contradicted by *sanctified reason.* To suppose otherwise is to make the letter and spirit of Christianity opposed one to the other. Whatever makes such a conflict, in our interpretation of the words of Scripture, must arise from a misunderstanding of the words themselves.

The followers of our Lord heard him say, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." When they heard this language "many said, This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" They overlooked the *spirit* of the words, and hence stumbled and fell. Had they stopped to *reflect*, instead of resting in the seeming meaning of the speaker, they would soon have learned that Jesus' words had a sense and meaning entirely the reverse from *their construction.* But it happened with them as with many since, their first impression governed their conduct, and it was useless to call their attention to the *spirit* of our Lord's words; for after all his

explanations, "many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him." So inveterate is prejudice or preconceived notions.

Those who overlook or disregard the *spirit* of Christianity, will stumble and fall into the most absurd and God-dishonoring notions of His designs, administration, or government; such notions as may prevent the full, or even partial, development of love in themselves, and retard, if not entirely overthrow it in others; while they will drive many away from Christianity altogether, by the harshness which they find attributed to the gospel.

Few of the readers of the EXAMINER will doubt but that such has been the result of the doctrine of *eternal* sin and suffering; sin and suffering where reformation is impossible; and which is without design to benefit the sufferers. Sin and suffering which can be of no benefit to any being in the universe, so far as we have any knowledge by revelation or otherwise. Our sanctified reason and love both revolt at such an administration; and, happily for us, we have been led to see that tho' some of the *words* of Scripture *seem* to favor such a doctrine, yet other Scriptures give evidence of the falsehood of such a doctrine; and the *spirit* of Christianity is totally opposed to such a construction of its words or letter.

Let the reader ponder these remarks and he may find them equally applicable to other traditionary notions which are built upon some expressions of Scripture, supposed to have a meaning which is equally opposed to the *spirit* of Christianity, and as much outraging reason and love.

From Henry Grew.

Dear Brother Storrs.—I have no doubt of the correctness of Respondent's view of 1 Cor. 15 : 22; also that of 1 Thess. 4 : 16. The word "*first*" refers to the resurrection of the dead saints prior to the changing of the living saints. It has no reference to the wicked dead. I would not pervert the word of the Lord to support the truth.

1 Tim. 4 : 10. "For, therefore, (*i. e.* for the sake of the gospel,) we both labor and suffer reproach because we trust in the living God who is the Savior of all men, (*i. e.* who saves all men from seen and unseen dangers, and evils, *in the present state,*) especially of those that believe," *i. e.*, God exercises a peculiar providential care over his believing children; of which truth the 91st Psalm is a beautiful and perfect illustration. The passage, I apprehend, has no reference to the future state.

1 Peter 3 : 19, 20. I understand that Christ, by the Spirit of God, given to Noah, "a preacher of righteousness," 2 Peter 2 : 5, went and preached "in the days of Noah," to the persons who were in the prison of the grave, or rather, as the Syriac version reads, "in *sepulchres*" when Peter wrote his epistle.

1 Cor. 15 : 16–18. "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins;" *i. e.*, you Corinthian believers who are now living. "Then they *also* which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." The manifest import is, that if the dead rise not, all ground of hope is gone, both in respect to those who are living in the faith of Christ, and those who have died in it. Here is no reference, I apprehend to the "wicked dead." So, Respondent must look elsewhere for "a clear declaration" that the wicked will not rise to temporary life to be "hurt by the second death."

Fraternally, in unabated love,

HENRY GREW.

Philadelphia, Jan. 24th, 1856.

N. B. Have you read the case of the English Dr. Palmer? Must not such men be reserved unto a future "day of judgment to be punished"? Is such a man, (who is here punished only as another man, vastly less guilty,) punished *according to his deeds?*

Response to H. Grew.

We had concluded to publish the foregoing letter without remarks, seeing Bro. G. and ourself so happily agreed on some points, but on second thoughts have concluded to say something.

We are not sure but Br. GREW has helped us to "a clear declaration" that the wicked dead will not live again. He objects to our suggestion that the word "*also,*" 1 Corth. 15 : 18, *may* refer to the wicked dead; he thinks it refers to the "living Corinthian believers." We are not certain but he is right in that view. We expressed no *positive* opinion in our previous remarks. Supposing Br. G. to be right in referring the word "also" to the "living believers:" what is said of them? "Your faith is vain; ye are yet *in your sins:*" *i. e.*, "if Christ be not raised." Why? Because, "if Christ be not raised," there "is no resurrection," and you "are in your sins"—unpardoned and under the curse that sin brings, *viz: death;* hence you will have no revival into life—no resurrection: "then they *also* who have fallen asleep in Christ *have perished,*" and will have no resurrection, because they died *in their sins.*

Now, what is all this but saying, if any man dies *in* his *sins* death has its natural course and

holds him under its power never to be revived into life? "Death is the wages of sin:" sin unpardoned—unremoved by a living union with the *living Christ*—holds its victim under death, and no power can extricate him even for a "temporary life."

Peter declared, on the day of Pentecost, that it "was not possible that" Christ "should be holden of death," Acts 2 : 24. Why was it not possible? Because he "knew no sin"—on him death had no claim. But suppose he had sinned; would not death have held him? Certainly; and man's deliverance would have been impossible. Men have sinned; and but for Christ and his revival into life, Br. Grew admits, "all ground of hope is gone." Why? Because men are yet *in their sins*." Very well. If sinners do not come to Christ to have their sins taken away, are they not "yet in their sins?" and if so, is not "all ground" for their revival into life removed? It really seems to us Br. G. has demonstrated that if men die "in their sins" there is "no ground" to expect their revival into life at all.

Thus, to be "in our sins," is to be without a revival from death, according to Paul's logic, or theology; and Br. Grew admits if the "living Corinthian believers" were "in their sins all ground of hope was gone;" that not these alone were excluded from hope of future life, but "then they *also* which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."

To be *in sins*, then, is to be excluded from a revival into life:

But all the wicked dead died *in their sins:*

Therefore, they will have no revival into life.

Such seems to us to be a logical conclusion from Br. G.'s construction of the text, and the reference of the term "also;" and being "in our sins" is in fact the reason assigned for *perishing* without a revival into life. This idea is in harmony with Paul's concluding remarks of this chapter. He says "The sting of death is sin:" *i. e., sin* is that which gives death its destructive power and its victory; and sin's power to hold its victim under death "*is the law*;" but to believers "God giveth the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ:" for unbelievers there is no deliverance from death; no not even a "temporary" one: "the wicked is driven away *in his wickedness;* but the righteous hath hope in his death:" Prov. 14 : 32. "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall *remain* in the congregation of the dead:" Prov. 21 : 16. Yea, "he shall be holden with the cords of his sins:" Prov. 5 : 22. Christ was raised from death; "God loosed the *pains*" [or, as some render it, "*the cords*"] "of death." By virtue of the cords of death being loosed in his case, all his members, *viz*, all true followers of Christ, shall have *victory* over death and have its *cords loosed* from them; but the wicked, dying in his sins, "shall be holden with the cords of his sins"—they "*remain* in the congregation of the dead." "*The dead*," who are revived into life, "shall be raised *incorruptible*," and "put on immortality:" 1 Corth. 15 : 52, 53. Such seems to our mind to be the truth on this deeply interesting subject, so far as our present light guides us.

The long and the short of the whole matter seems to be this—Any life after death is a gospel *benefit* or *privilege;* and peculiar to those, and to those *alone*, who do not die in their sins; or who come to Christ that they "may have life:" John 5 : 40. All others are "holden with the cords of their sins;" and follow the condition of Adam the first, who was mortal, corruptible, and without any life principle to revive from the dead; that life principle is *alone* in Adam the second, and communicated to none but his members; or to those in him; and who are delivered from their sins.

Rev. John Howard Hinton, of England, the strongest writer that has ever written against our views, speaking of our Lord's discourse with the Sadducees, Lk. 20 : 27–38, and endeavoring to establish the idea that the dead are in a conscious state, and that all men, good and bad, "will live forever," or are immortal, attempts to sustain the position that it is not the righteous alone our Lord speaks of as attaining that world, or a future life. He says:

"Let it be supposed that our Lord did refer to the righteous only; * * * in that case his words would seem to imply that there is no future existence for any but the righteous; since his speaking of them *peculiarly* as living after death may fairly be held to exclude others."

Mr. Hinton, of course rejects the sentiment which he says is a *fair* conclusion, from the idea that our Lord was speaking of the righteous only, who *cannot* "die any more."

Now *we* have no doubt that our Lord was speaking of the "righteous *only*," in that discourse; hence, according to Mr. Hinton's admission, "it may be fairly held to exclude others," *viz:* all the wicked, from "future existence," or *life;* even a "temporary" one; and as the Scriptures never speak of the wicked being restored to a "*temporary life*," we are not prepared to give up our *doubts* of there being any such life for them.

One word on Br. Grew's concluding *inquiry*. Scripture is silent about men being "*punished* ac-

cording to their deeds." Every one shall "*receive* according to that he hath done." The righteous "*receive*" *life*. The wicked "*receive*" *death*—"*everlasting destruction:*" *death* from which there is *no recovery*. That is receiving, or being "punished," if the expression is liked better, "according to his deeds. Christianity, *in its spirit*, forbids all "cruel and unusual punishment;" and no construction of its *letter* is admissible which contradicts its *spirit*. Hence when a sinner is dead to make *alive* again to *torment* him, without any design to reform him, or benefit any of his race, looks like a pure and unmitigated act of *revenge;* a feeling which we can never consent to fix on our CREATOR without clear and unequivocal testimony of the CREATOR Himself. Such testimony *we* have not yet seen; if Br. G. has, we do not blame *him* for crediting it.

From C. F. Hudson.

East Cleveland, Jan. 28, 1856.

DEAR BRO. STORRS.—After a longer delay than I anticipated when I left Cincinnati, I am again at work upon my book. Hope to have it in shape to seek for a publisher in six or seven weeks, though I must revise and retouch a good deal, ere I finish.

I have taken some interest in the question of the resurrection of the wicked, and have thought of preparing an article for your paper. But it would require some care, and I must economize my time.

There is a passage in Isaac Taylor's "Wesley and Methodism" which merits a notice that it has not yet received. If you have not yet published it, you may think it worth while to do so. By the by, we ought not to regard the author as dogmatic in his views of the absolute immortality of the soul; for in his "Physical Theory" he states the argument for immortality in such a way that the careful reader will see that it covers only the immortality of the good. (See pp. 135–37, 190, 212, Gowan's Ed.) What particular view he designs to intimate in the following passage, I cannot say. He speaks, after his usual custom, in general and ethical terms. Having spoken of a change awaiting our theology like that produced by the Baconian Philosophy, which "will effect the final expulsion of metaphysical schemes of doctrine, in the room of which will come the fearless THEOLOGY OF INTERPRETATION," he says:—

"A popular ministration of Christianity, which should lay anew a solid foundation on this ground, and which should thence move forward to awaken the fears of men as guilty, could not fail to convulse the social system; and especially as there would follow close upon it a more distinct and impulsive interpretation of those passages that are affirmatory of future punishment. The past Methodism took to itself the belief which it found; but the coming Methodism must derive its belief *anew* from Scripture, by bringing to bear upon this difficult subject a reformed principle of biblical interpretation.

"The urgent necessity that will be felt by the preachers of the future time for making good every step of their ground, when they come, in the present state of opinion, to assail the consciences of men—infatuated more than stupified—must lead to consequences that are little apprehended. When once this weighty question of the after life has been opened, and when it shall have come into the hands of well informed Biblical interpreters, a controversy will ensue, in the progress of which it will be discovered that, with unobservant eyes, we and our predecessors have been so walking up and down, and running hither and thither, among dim notices and indications of the future destinies of the human family, as to have failed to gather up, or to regard, much that has lain upon the pages of the Bible, open and free to our use. Those who, through a course of years, have been used to read the Scriptures, unshackled by systems, and bound to no conventional modes of belief, such readers must have felt an impatience in waiting, not for the arrival of a new revelation from Heaven, but of an ample and unfettered interpretation of that which has been so long in our hands.

"Thus the future Methodism, as we assume, will feel the need of, and will acquire for itself, under pressure of the most urgent motives, and incontrovertible exposition of the Scripture doctrine concerning the future administrations of justice; but then it will not make this acquisition as if it could be held as an insulated dogma; for whatever is further ascertained on this ground, will come to stand in its true relationship to much beside, which in the same argument, will have started to view as the genuine sense of the inspired books. The doctrine of future punishment, as a belief drawn from Scripture, and so drawn as to dissipate prevalent illusions, and to spread on all sides a salutary and effective charm—such a belief will take its place in the midst of an expanded prospect of the compass and intention of the Christian system.

"The past Methodism was far from being a message of wrath, proclaimed by men of fierce and fanatical tempers;—it was a message of joy, hope, and love; and it made its conquests as such, notwithstanding those bold and unmeasured denunciations against sin which it so often uttered. And so it will be with the future Methodism; and although it will rest itself upon a distinct and laboriously obtained belief concerning "the wrath to come," a belief such as will heave the human mind with a deep and convulsive dread, yet, and notwithstanding this preliminary, the renovation which we look for will come in as the splendor of day comes in the tropics—it will be a sudden brightness that makes all things glad!"—pp. 289, 290.

Have you noticed the new work by the author of the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation?" He is, theologically, if I mistake not, inclined to the doctrine of the immortality of the good alone.

The following passages from his new work will illustrate his style of reasoning upon the subject:—

"GERMS OF A FUTURE AND BETTER LIFE PERCEPTIBLE IN THE SPIRITUAL CONSTITUTION OF GOOD MEN.

"It is well known to naturalists that Swammerdam, by a process not necessary to detail here, discovered the lineaments of the butterfly in the caterpillar, even before its metamorphosis into a chrysalis.

"This fact has its analogy in the spiritual economy of all *good* men.* We say all *good* men, because it is true that there are many of the human family who possess an *inoperative* instinct of immortality, but in whose bosoms no spiritual insight can discover the *lineaments* of a future life. We use the analogy, therefore, only so far as it goes. But have we not in this analogy, viewed in the light of Swammerdam's discovery, a distinct intimation of the *anastasis* of those individuals of the human family in whose bosoms are found the germs of a life, the intuitions and habitudes of which differ from those of the present existence?" *Sacred Philosophy*, p, 142.

Again: "Every law has its penalty. Natural penalty, or, rather, the *penalty natural to law*, is progressive derangement tending to ultimate destruction. If disorder be not immediately destructive, then, during the deranged action which follows departure from law, the subject, by interposition, may be recovered to obedience; but if not recovered, the destruction of the subject, whatever it may be, *is necessary* and therefore certain." P. 159. Compare pp. 178–181.

I observe we are to have a couple of prize articles in defence of the common view in the *New Englander*, in February and April. This is a sign of the times.

I may, after about the first of May, go to Boston or Andover to finish my book. But this depends on finding a publisher. If I go, it may be *via* New York, when I shall be happy to make more full acquaintance with you. Our petty speculative differences are the same that they were—but we are one in the hope through Christ.

Yours, truly,

C. F. HUDSON.

* It was ascertained by Raumer that an injury inflicted upon the chrysalis produces a defect in the future fly. And those who have observed know that in many species the greater number of nymphæ *utterly perish in their own pupæ*.

† The spirit of adoption in our hearts claims for us, in our greatest need, Divine interposition through the intercession of our High Priest and Advocate.

Napoleon and Jerusalem,

In the last EXAMINER we gave an extract from an English writer on prophecy, and we give in this number another extract from his *Tract* issued in December last. He says:—

The Emperor Napoleon having frightened the English government into war, and having played upon the simplicity of the English people, got quiet and complete possession of Constantinople and the Dardanelles—the keys of the East. He then went on to get possession of Sebastopol and the Black Sea. *His* army alone took Sebastopol, and his army alone will KEEP IT. Having thus laid the foundation of his Eastern empire, it next became advisable to advance into the heart of the East. Accordingly he sends his lieutenant, Abdel-Kader, to Damascus, in order to get possession of Syria, and to collect the Arabs to the French standard. The next great possession in advance was Palestine and Jerusalem. Therefore, while Abdel-Kader was on his way to Damascus, another agent was on his way to Jerusalem, as consul or ambassador of France. This new agent has outstripped Abdel-Kader, and has already established French supremacy in Jerusalem. In the Morning Chronicle for Friday, November the 2nd, you will find the first or only announcement of what may prove the most MOMENTOUS OCCURRENCE OF THE AGE. On Sunday, the 30th of September, 1855, the French flag was hoisted at Jerusalem—the French Emperor made the patron of the Holy Places—and prayers offered up for him by all the clergy—as if Jerusalem were a part of his own empire. This, we assert, was a virtual OCCUPATION of Jerusalem, and an actual assertion of the French SUPREMACY. This is more than enough for the *first* step. He will do nothing to create suspicion or alarm, but will now proceed gradually to gain complete possession, both civil and military, until, by and by, he will make Jerusalem a great military position, and the base of his operations in the conquest of the East. You will not find this in the public papers at large. The public press which cannot see through the trausparent designs of France upon Constantinople, is too silly to see through anything! Yet the Morning Chronicle lets in one glimmer of truth upon the nation, and betrays its secret uneasiness by the following significant words:—"While our attention is fixed upon the events in the Crimæa, the French are settling the disputed question of the Holy Places of Jerusalem, *in their own way*." Oh! how true! While we are shouting like children for victories in the Crimæa, which we did *not* gain, the French are getting into their hands all the vital positions of the East, and leaving England absolutely NOTHING! We are looking out of the window at the *bonfires*, while our allies are stealing the plate off our sideboard!—now and then putting in an *huzza* in order to keep up the *diversion*.

In the course of these mournful and horrible events we have seen extracts of letters from officers in the Crimæa, which assert that the French have taken possession of Constantinople, and have so completely changed Sebastopol into a French town, that no British soldier, under arms, is per-

mitted to enter it without a pass from the French commandant. In a word, France is making us her tools, to conquer, not only the empire of Napoleon, but the empire of the East. Our ships being far off, and our army at home being a crowd of *boys*, we dare not refuse even the meanest office, even the most audacious demand! If we dared to do so, our whole army would be shut up by the French in the Dardanelles, and our own shores invaded from Cherbourg and Boulogne. We are compelled to drink the dregs of that cup which we put into the hands of France at Waterloo—and it is a just retribution for our pride; but it is also an eternal warning never to permit a country to be governed, or a war to be undertaken, in compliance with the wishes of "The People." Such a compliance has, in all ages, been the ruin of Empires.

The seizure of the Holy Places, and, in fact, of Jerusalem itself, is the greatest of all the great events which have occurred within the 19th century. The rest are great only politically, this event is great SCRIPTURALLY. It looks like the "Beginning of the End." It opens the way for the whole train of prophecy. It would be impossible in a single number to refer to all the prophetic statements on the subject of the Jews, but the outline can easily be traced. It appears from the 9th of Daniel, from Isaiah, from Joel, and from Zechariah, that a strict CONFEDERACY will be formed between the Jews and the Last Antichrist—the Eighth Head of the Roman empire. The 9th of Daniel is by far the most explicit upon this point. "He (the Eighth Head) shall confirm the covenant with many for one week;" that is to say, for *one seven years*—which is the correct meaning of the text. Isaiah, in the 18th chapter, and elsewhere, expressly indicates a partial restoration of the Jews, in their own strength, and under the patronage of some Gentile power. This restoration is proved both by Isaiah and by Zechariah to be a *godless* restoration, undertaken solely in ungodly dependence upon human aid, and without reference to God. Daniel takes up the same question, and goes further still; for he speaks of an actual *treaty* for seven years between Antichrist and the Jews. We have just seen, from Isaiah, that some Gentile nation is to bring back the Jews to their own land, independant of the Divine approval. If we unite these circumstances together, we shall come to the following result:—The Jews are to make efforts to restore and to establish themselves by the aid of the Gentiles, and to form a treaty with some great Gentile sovereign for that purpose. By this help they are to be restored and reëstablished in Jerusalem and Palestine; not, indeed, *all* of them, but a large number, especially of the unbelieving Jews, who are now very numerous. A covenant for one week of years is to be made between the restored Jews and the protecting powers. But, in the midst of the seven years (after three years and a half), a quarrel is to break out, and the protecting power is to turn into a persecuting power. This, no doubt, will be the time of Antichrist, or the Eighth Head. He will, at first, become the patron of the Jews, form a league with them, and restore them. He will, then, after three years and a half, attempt to set himself up to be worshipped; and then, finding his attempt resisted, he will begin to persecute. Many of the Jews will still continue to adhere to him, as it appears from Daniel 11, verse 32; but others will resist him. And then, between these two conflicting parties, a state of war and persecution will commence, which will only be terminated by the siege of Jerusalem and the descent of the Lord upon the Mount of Olives. (Zechariah 12th, 13th, and 14th.) So that the crisis of the age, and the completion of prophecy, are both dependent on the league between Antichrist and the Jews, and upon the first national Restoration of the Jews to their own land.

In the midst of this corruption and apostasy of the Jews at large, we find in Scripture that a certain number will continue faithful in the highest degree. (Dan. 11th, verse 32, &c., &c.) These men will constitute what is usually called "the Jewish Remnant," and will be saved from the destruction which shall fall upon the unfaithful members of their nation. Some of them being carried safely through all the terrible judgments, to the moment of the Second Advent, and others, though put to death by Antichrist, yet entering upon eternal glory along with the other resurrection saints, at the *opening of the millennium*. Thus, it appears, there will be two classes of Jews in the Holy land during the reign of Antichrist—the apostate and the faithful. And here it is proper to notice a remarkable circumstance—the largest body of *faithful Jews* in the world is to be found in the CRIMÆA! They are the KARAITES—the purest and most faithful of all the Jewish race; they adhere solely to the word of God, and reject the opinion of the Rabbinical commentators. Do you think that the invasion of the Crimea was a stroke of human policy? It was appointed by the providence of God, for the liberation of those very Karaite Jews, who are, no doubt, to form the central point of the faithful Jewish Remnant during the persecution of Antichrist! While the so-called Christian world is only thinking of the success of the moment, God is looking forward to the establishment of his own eternal councils.

The liberation of these Karaite Jews from the Crimæa will hereafter form an important element in Jewish affairs. By such means as these an opposition will be formed on the side of the true Messiah against the false one. The great Antichristian monarch who is to bring back the Jews, and to form the seven years league with them, is, evidently, the person who will be set up as the Jewish Messiah in opposition to the son of David. This man, whoever he may be, will pretend to be an Israelite by descent, and will be received as the MESSIAH by all the apostates among the Jews; but the Karaites and the faithful remnant will resist his pretensions to the death. Of this we have abundance of proof in the prophetic Scriptures, but we are not told from what tribe or family the false Messiah is to arise. The present Emperor of the French has two christian names, one of which contains the number of the Beast in Latin; for the Beast, or Eighth Head, is to be a *Latin* Emperor—Emperor of Rome. The other name contains

the number of the Beast in *Greek*, because Greek is the original language in which the prophecy was written. This coincidence of two such names in the same man, and that man the master both of Rome and Jerusalem, is a most remarkable fact. But he has a further resemblance to the character of Antichrist—his features are Jewish, exactly those of a Jew; and so many distinguished public men have proved to be Israelites in origin, such as Massena, Suchet, and others who professed to be Gentiles, so may it be with Napoleon; his family may be traced up to a Jewish ancestor, and his features are such as make the circumstance very probable. Or else he may pretend to be of Jewish origin. by tampering with some Jewish genealogy, and received as the true Messiah by the apostate Jews. A very little evidence would incline such men to follow any false Messiah, provided he was powerful enough to advance their worldly interests.

The present occupation of Jerusalem by the French may be the immediate forerunner of these prophetic events. We have all the elements of revolution already prepared. We see before us a man—who is master of Rome, Constantinople, and Jerusalem—whose armies are daily pouring into the East—whose names, both in Greek and Latin, contain the number of the Beast—who is, *de facto*, Emperor of France, and virtually Emperor of Rome—whose connexion with all the leading Jews is of the most intimate character—who depends upon them for money as they look up to him for patronage—whose very features speak of Jewish origin. This man has made himself actually supreme in Jerusalem, and master of the Holy Places—virtually he is master of Jerusalem itself. The next move will be an obvious one, namely, to take advantage of the repeated quarrels between the Greek and Latin clergy, and to send a French garrison to Jerusalem under the pretence of keeping them quiet. From that day the work will proceed rapidly, or rather it has already begun. The great Jewish capitalists will furnish him with money; and he will repay the loan by establishing them in their native land, and by permitting the rebuilding of the *Jewish altars*, and the renewal of the *Jewish sacrifices*. Nothing is more likely, since once the French Emperor has gained a firm footing in Jerusalem, and every day a further advance may be effected towards this consummation. It will be objected that neither the Sultan nor the Pope will approve of any such arrangement. What! restore the Jewish altars and sacrifices—neither Turks nor Roman Catholics would endure such preparation! Neither the Pope nor the Sultan can venture to interfere—they are both the abject dependants of the Emperor Napoleon. He employs the name of each to cover his own vast designs—but were either Pope or Sultan to venture upon opposition, they would meet with the fate of all his other opponents! England itself is completely under his control—how much more the Pope or the Sultan. Men fancy that he is the instrument of the Pope and the Jesuits. We undertake to say that the Pope and the Jesuits are *his* instruments, and that he will turn them about as it suits his own designs. Whenever he feels it necessary to *borrow Jewish money* he will restore the Jews (and the Jewish sacrifices) in spite of all remonstrance, provided he is paid for it.

The "possession of Jerusalem by the French" is the single subject of this number. It is now a FACT which requires nothing more to establish it. Wherever the French Emperor once hoists his flag there he remains with relentless tenacity. The occupation of Rome, nearly seven years ago, is a sufficient proof. Has he ever quitted Rome since, though always *threatening* to do it? Never! Neither will he quit Sebastopol, Constantinople, or Jerusalem; and, "like a young lion," who shall dare to stir him up? We have only to look on with patience (and humility) and see France supreme in the Holy Land; a French garrison in Jerusalem—all from pure love of peace! The Jews and the great Jewish capitalists in league with Napoleon as his agents and vassals in the East—Jewish altars built—the warlike tribes of the Syrian desert united under Abdel-Kader, and in firm alliance with the Emperor—and everything rapidly preparing for the fulfilment of prophecy and the mighty events of the last times—for Antichrist, the False Prophet, and Armageddon!

A Presentiment

Is an impression on the mind, that *something is going to take place*, and usually such is the case; perhaps we may say without exaggeration, that something always does occur, after a presentiment is formed: if such were not the fact, we cannot conjecture what would become of every body.—Just imagine for a moment, that something did not take place in such a large world as this!

Presentiments love weak places, hence they flourish among weak-minded people, not necessarily weak minded by nature, but made so by a diseased body. We are told of a young lady at Kinderhook, who was visited by an apparition two years ago, at dead hour of night, which announced to her in solemn accents, that in two years she would be the inhabitant of another and a better world; this circumstance, had such a depressing influence on her mind, that she pined away by degrees and did die, at the close of the term named, and was buried a few days ago.

An eminent clergyman, on parting from another in St. Louis, said: "I have a strong presentiment that we shall never meet again," and within a few hours he perished at the Gasconade on the Pacific Railway.

An almost infallible cure for presentiment, however violent, is a good emetic, a grubbing hoe, with a few days bread and water diet. For ourselves, we would omit the emetic, as we do not patronize physic, except by proxy. The reason we give medicine at all is that people are always in a hurry, not exactly to get well, but to get able to eat; if they can only eat, nine out of ten think they are getting along famously. Every body wants to get well in a minute, and for the bare chances of doing so, with a slight degree of assurance to that effect from any knave who is willing to promise, it having the wit to see at a glance that the assurance must be father to the fee—we repeat, with a very slim assurance of being made well in a short time,

the large majority of invalids would swallow a quart of Shakspeare's soup thrice a day, said soup being made, as the reader may remember, by several old witches, of such things as newt's eyes, frog's toes, lizzard wings, stings of rattle-snakes, and other ingredients not necessary to be named, but all brought to the climatic point by—onions.

An emetic will dissipate a presentiment in five minutes, while the vigorous use of the grubbing hoe in the open air, would work off the extra and thick blood, abuse accumulation in the brain generates these diseased imaginings, while the diet of bread and water would supply a pure article of blood in the place of the impure material.

Whoever heard of a healthy, out door, day laborer, having a "Presentiment" in the pursuit of his occupation? The fact is, they have not time to be moping about such tom-fooleries; the only presentiment that ever troubles them is a veritable fact, a tangible reality. "Root Pig, or Die," is their ever living ghost.

Presentiments do not exist except in connection with one of the three following things—1. A weak mind. 2d. A diseased body. 3d. An idle condition of life.

Loafing and gluttony are the great originators of this unfortunate condition of mind, and its almost certain removal follow in temperate eating, combined with physical activity. If unattended to, and friendly death does not step in to save from a greater calamity, insanity winds up the history,

To the reflecting, we suggest a fact which dissipates the mystery which hangs around "Presentiments." In ordinary cases, a thing is not baptized as a "Presentiment," until the coincidence of the fact. Superstitious minds, in which presentiments mostly dwell, take no note of the countless impressions that certain things might take place, which did not afterwards take place; one such coincidence makes an impression against a million non-concurrents.—*Hall's N. Y. Journal of Health.*

Palestine.—It is with deep regret that we have heard of the decease of Mrs. Minor of the Palestine Agricultural Mission. This lady, formerly of Philadelphia, first visited Palestine under an enthusiastic impression that the time had arrived for the fulfilment of the prophecies in reference to Israel's restoration, and that she might be instrumental in furthering the work. Prudence might have dictated a different course, and certainly a more calculating policy would have prevented her from encountering the hardships of such an enterprise. Once there, and the field before her, her views were materially corrected, and her devotion, although not diminished, became more chastened and practical. She labored assiduously for the benefit of the suffering and degraded Jews, and we have the best reason for knowing that, through her agency, much good was accomplished. When the agricultural scheme was projected she entered into it heartily, and as we have before stated, not only did she remove the prejudice of Jewish Rabbis against their people entering upon the cultivation of the soil, but her example was influential in calling forth similar enterprises. When we were fully aware that Mrs. Minor and her assistants held views, particularly in observing the seventh instead of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath, which we did not entertain, yet we could not, in the absence of all other efforts in behalf of the Jews of Palestine, but feel a deep interest in her efforts, especially as the project was rather a preliminary and agricultural one for the temporal benefit of the Jews, than a strictly religious mission. We have, in despite of much prejudice against Mrs. Minor and her plans, adhered to our first convictions, and have seen no sufficient reason for repenting of our course. From a long correspondence with Mrs. Minor, we have been led to form a high estimate of her piety; and in the course of her work we have had abundant evidence of her courage, practical determination, and executive talent. Her labors have, humanly speaking, hastened her departure from life, and what may be the effect of such a loss to the scheme itself, we cannot foresee. We must await the indications of Providence. When further intelligence reaches us we shall communicate it to our readers.

The foregoing editorial remarks are from the "Presbyterian" of Jan. 12; "The American Agricultural Mission to Palestine," to which Mrs. Minor belongs has given rise to a grand series of similar efforts by about an half score of associations—both Jewish and Christians, English, German and American. All of which derives additional interest from the revival of the question of "the Holy Places"—a question that seems to underlie the present Eastern war; of which Lord John Russell said in reply to the inquiry of a distinguished Jew of Vienna, "There shall no solution transpire that shall not place the Jews on a level with the most favored classes."

The casting away of Judah was made the occasion of giving the Gospel to the nations; and their restoration is to be the occasion of a farther world-wide blessing, "for if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead." Rom. 11, 12, 27.

J. B. Cook.

A Quiet Spirit—Its Power.

The Quakers have taught us a lesson which it would be well for us to teach ourselves, and that is *quietness.* Not only is great strength wasted by excitement, but an appearance of weakness given in its place. To look grave is a great wisdom as well as a great art. A bundle of fire-crackers contain much more powder than a loaded pistol, but it operates very differently. The one starts a series of ineffectual but noisy little emissions a short distance in all directions, the other shoots far and deep in one. And the reason of the difference is one worth study. In the one case the barrel is of paper, in the other of steel. The energy of the one is scattered by its shell, that of the other concentrated. We should recollect this in matters

religious as well as secular. We discredit as well as dissipate our religious character by a discomposed and restless manner. And self-compression and self-chastisement are nearly allied to humility. The man that waits *at all*, soon learns *to wait upon the Lord.* And indeed there is something exquisitely attractive as well as comforting in composure. It is a great deal to sit in peace while the world is rocking about, for it proves to us that we are steadied by a power above the world. To the Christian there is peculiar value in this. It is the only quality by which we can disarm the world, for while the world can meet him with wit, and strength, and sometimes argument, it cannot meet him with peace. In the Christian's humility and peacefulness, also, is his aggressive power. In families this is greatly the case, for the meek manner has wrought all the conversions which the little family senate knows,—the eloquent tongue none. *A meek and quiet spirit*, let my prayer be, *give me, O God!—Episcopal Recorder.*

"The Resurrection *of the Dead opposed to the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul.*"—The *Essays* on this subject by an English writer of 1823, which we commenced to republish in July last, are now finished. The one in this number of the Examiner occupies more space than we would like, but we saw no way to divide it, as it should be all read together.

These *Essays* ought to be issued in a pamphlet for general distribution; but we have no means to do such work. We do not indorse every sentiment or idea found in them; and probably the same writer, if still alive, by this time has received further light: but as a whole, and in the main, the *Essays* are invaluable.

Eld. Jacob Blain, of Buffalo, N. Y., has issued two *tracts*, viz.: "*Letter of Rev. John Foster on Future Punishment*," and "*The Bible meaning of the word Hell.*" The latter is mainly the third chapter of his work "Death not Life." The former is the Letter of Foster published in the Examiner some time since. Both can be had by addressing Eld. J. Blain as above.

A Treatise on the 24th and 25th Chapters of Matthew, showing the fulfillment of most of the predictions of Christ, by copious extracts from history, consequently that the Gentile times are nearly ended, and the Kingdom of God soon to come. By J. C. Wellcome, Hallowell, Me.—For sale by J. M. Fairchild & Co., 109 Nassau street, New-York. Price 33 cts. Postage 6 cts.

Day of the Crucifixion.

An opinion once expressed by us that the thief did not die the same day Jesus did, drew a note from Br. H. Grew, which we published Dec. 1st, of last year, with a response. That response brought us a note from another brother, on the same topic, which we give below. We do not think the subject of enough importance to go into further discussion.

"Concerning the day of Christ's crucifixion, I wish to present for your consideration the following suggestion, which I have not seen in any writer. 'The next day after, the day of preparation' is the most positive testimony that the crucifixion occurred on Thursday; for the next day after was the day of preparation, which was always on Friday. This is learned by putting the two parts of the sentence in apposition. The *day* of *preparation*, being the same as the *next day after*. This view of Matt. 27: 62, is very apparent, if we place a comma after 'the next day after,' which seems necessary to preserve the harmony of sacred Scripture; and then also the 'Preparation' was for the Sabbath, and not the Passover as you suggest; which seems rather unnatural. J. I. C."

Note by the Editor.—If Br. "J. I. C." will look at our quotation of John 19: 14, which he seems to have overlooked, he will see that the day of the crucifixion was the same as "*the preparation* of the passover." If there was not two distinct preparation days spoken of, *viz.* that of the Passover and another for the Sabbath, we confess we see no way to harmonize the account as a whole. But we wish not to protract the question; and leave our brother's remarks for the consideration of the reader, simply observing, we are agreed that the crucifixion took place on *Thursday.*

The Parted Spirit.

BY J. MACOLM.

"Ye cannot tell whence it cometh, or whither it goeth."

Mysterious in its birth,
And viewless as the blast;
Where hath the spirit fled from earth,
Forever past?

I ask the grave below—
It keeps the secret well;
I call upon the heavens to show—
They will not tell.

Of earth's remotest strand
Are tales and tidings known;
But from the spirit's distant land
Returneth none.

Winds waft the breath of flowers
To wanderers o'er the wave,
But bear no message from the bowers
Beyond the grave.

Proud science scales the skies—
From star to star doth roam;
But reacheth not the shore where lies
The spirit's home.

Impervious shadows hide
This mystery of heaven;
But where all knowledge is denied,
To hope is given.—*Ch. Ad.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, MARCH 1, 1856. NO. 5

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 141 Fulton-street.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive?

FROM H. H. HALL.

Peru, Ind., Jan. 28th, 1856.

Dear Bro. Storrs.—When I wrote the few lines on the subject of the discussion, which you have seen fit to publish, I did not expect to be drawn into the discussion; neither do I *now* intend to write again on the subject, as I have not the time to do so. But as you have noticed my letter in connection with another brother's, and as your answer has not convinced me that I am wrong in my view of 1 Cor. 15; 21–24—I have thought it proper to reply to your arguments, being very kindly permitted, by you, thus to do.

You admit that if my view is the *true one*, it settles the question: but from this view BRO. GREW dissents, and in this dissent you agree: you are also united in the belief that Paul, in his discourse (1 Cor. 15:) saith not one word of the resurrection of the wicked dead: to suppose he does, *you* say, is to suppose he was a teacher of *universal salvation*. BRO. GREW says in the same connection—"I am not a Universalist." Can it be possible that BRO. STORRS and BRO. GREW believe that if the Apostle teaches the *resurrection* of *all* men in this chapter, that he necessarily teaches the *salvation* of *all* men? I should be very slow in yielding *that* much to Universalists. I have never found any difficulty in all my arguments with that class, on this chapter, in silencing and driving them to some other fancied strong-hold. You say, "Paul does teach that *the dead*, of whose resurrection he speaks in this chapter, are raised in *incorruption* and in glory:—that *the dead*, spoken of *shall be raised incorruptible*, and shall put on immortality: verses 42, 43, 52, 54. If then we admit verse 22 is proof *positive* of the resurrection of the wicked dead, the verses we have spoken of are equally *positive proof* of their rising in glory, incorruptibility, and immortality, and such is precisely the argument of Universalists." *I* cannot see *this* as *you* do. There is to my mind a plain difference between "*the dead*" of verses 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, and "*the dead*" of verse 42; the connection in the two cases, shows a *marked* distinction. In the first verses named, the Apostle was doubtless showing that *if* Christ was not resurrected, then there could be no resurrection of *the dead*—righteous or wicked. He says, verse 12—"Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of *the dead*? But if there be no resurrection of *the dead*, then is Christ not risen." He does *not* say, "if there be no resurrection of the SAINTS," as he doubtless would have done, if he had reference *only* to *them:* but he speaks of the resurrection of *the* dead, without limitation, as he *must* speak if he *intended* to embrace *all*. Verse 16, "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye" [my brethren] "are yet in your sins. Then" [even] "they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished," [as well as the wicked] "if Christ be not raised."

I believe with you, that the word "*also*" here distinguishes those who have fallen asleep in Christ, from the wicked dead; not that they are all "*hopelessly dead, dead past revival into life*," but *only* dead in *that* sense, in case Christ were not raised. I have paraphrased the language of the apostle to suit this idea.

Paul continues, verse 20, "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." Admit that "*them that slept*" are, as you believe, the same as those that "are fallen asleep *in* Christ," (as the term *sleep* is never applied to the wicked dead) and also that "Christ can by no means be said to be the first fruits of the *wicked* dead," for the reason you assign—and though the resurrection of Christ *be* no *pledge* of their revival; yet it does not necessarily follow that Paul has *not* taught *their* resurrection in verses 12–24; nor that Christ will not raise them if the word of God teaches their resurrection.

On verses 21, 22, you ask—"What is the import of the words *even so?* How came men to die? Was it not by being *in* Adam? or in consequence of a union with him? Truly, say you. Very well; then does not '*even so*' impart a *union* with Christ in order to being *made alive?*" Hence you add, "The one Adam brought death to *all in* him." This argument is very plausible at first sight, and has some force, especially if your *premise* is correct. But is it correct? I think not. You *assume* that the words "*in* Christ," upon which you found the argument, has the *same* meaning as the *same* words have in the expressions "asleep *in* Christ," verse 18, and "the dead *in* Christ," 1st Thess. 4: 16. Is the assumption valid? If it is the argument is a good one so far as it goes; if it is not valid, then the argument is not good. Let us see. As you have quoted Prof. Murdock's translation

of the Syriac version, I will do the same on verses 21, 22—paraphrasing them. "And as by a man" [Adam] "came death," [to all] "so also by a man" [Christ] "came the reviviscence" [or resurrection] "of" [all] "the dead. For as it was BY Adam, that ALL men" [righteous and wicked] "die, so also *by*" (not *in*, but BY) "the Messiah THEY ALL" [righteous and wicked shall] "live" [again.] Thus according to the translation (and who will dispute or doubt its correctness here) we have the most positive testimony, according to the grammatical construction of v. 22, that Paul here teaches the resurrection of "all men." Mark the language.—"For as it was BY Adam that ALL men" [not a *part*] "die, so also BY the Messiah THEY" [who? why the '*all men*' that die *by* Adam, for the pronoun '*they*' can refer to nothing else] "all" [shall] "live" [again.] Now the question recurs, is the assumption spoken of, valid? I ask, my dear brother, in the light of the above translation and argument, is your position correct on the words—"*in* Christ shall all be made alive?" If it is not, your whole argument on this chapter, it appears to me, must fall; for it is your main pillar. Once admit that it is *by* Christ, instead of *in* Christ, that *all* are to be made *alive* and it settles the controversy, as my brother has admitted when he says, "if their view (of 1 Cor 15; 22,) be the *true one* it settles the question."

But to proceed: verse 23, "But every man" [every *saint*, *you* must say, (but *every saint* is not EVERY *man*) shall be made *alive*] "in his own order" [or under his own banner.] "The expression *every man* in his own order, *cohort* or *band*," you are of the opinion, "has reference only to the same thing he (Paul) speaks of in verses 41 and 42, a difference among them that are Christ's, arising from the different capacities and circumstances in which they had lived," &c. You say of the above it is your *opinion*, as though you were not fully decided in regard to it. To be doubtful on this important point, being inseparably connected with v. 22, is to be doubtful, I think, on the main point at issue; for I cannot see in what other way you can explain it, unless it is that the *order* of the resurrection *may* have reference to the various Christian sects in the world, such as Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, &c.; instead of to a peculiar resurrection of each individual saint, as your position, *if* correct, shows will take place, though novel and inconsistent as it appears. But the *banners* of the different sects will not do; because Christ is the great standard-bearer of all true Christians and under His banner *all* the ransomed church will come up in the *first* resurrection. The Devil is the standard-bearer of all the wicked, and under his banner they will all be made *alive*, not *in* Christ, but *by* Christ, that they may die the second death. It is to this, doubtless, that Paul has reference when he says, "but *every man*" (*not* saint) shall be made alive under his own banner. "Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." [This constitutes the *first* resurrection.] "Then cometh the end," &c. You say, "not then cometh another resurrection." But if Paul has here given the order of the resurrection of *the* dead, does not the expression "*then cometh the end*"—have as much reference to *that order*, as the language of the preceeding verse? which, you admit, refers to the resurrection in *order*, though the word *resurrection* does not there occur, being only necessarily implied, but no more so than in the words, "*then cometh the end.*" "Then cometh the end" of what? To my mind it is very clear that it is the END of the resurrection of *all* THE DEAD, the *order* of which is so plainly given by the apostle.

Having given my opinion and arguments on verses 12–24, and noticed my brother's, I proceed to notice verses 42–44. "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body."

You think that "verse 22 is proof positive of the resurrection of the *wicked dead*," that these verses "are equally positive proof of their rising in *glory*, *incorruptibility* and *immortality*." I think not. As I have remarked before, the connection in the two cases, the first of which I have noticed, shows a marked distinction between "*the dead*" of verses 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, and "*the dead*" of verse 42. I will now notice the connection of the latter and also your remarks on the same.

Verses 45–49:—"So also it is written, Adam the first man became a living soul: the second Adam [became] a quickening spirit. And the spiritual was not first, but the animal, and then the spiritual. The first man was of the dust, from the earth; the second man was the Lord from heaven." (Murdock's translation.) "As is the earthy" [in respect to the resurrection] "such are" [shall be] "they also that are" [or remain] "earthy" [or wicked, for they shall "*reap corruption*," and *this* does not refer to the *first* death, for the *Christian* does not "*reap everlasting life*" till raised, so the wicked will not reap *this* corruption till *they* are raised; "neither doth *corruption* inherit *incorruption*" or immortality, the Universalist to the contrary, notwithstanding.] "And as is the heavenly, such" [in respect to *their* resurrection] "are" [shall be] "they also that are heavenly" [who *only* shall reap incorruption and immortality, v. 42.]—"And as WE" [Christians] "have borne the image of the earthy" [first Adam] "*we* shall also" [having *become* heavenly] "bear the image of the heavenly" [the second Adam.] Such I understand to be the true teaching of the apostle: and *not* as you say, that because "death and corruption came by the animal man, Adam the first," there being "no life, or revival principle *in* him; and hence going down to the *earth* in him," [Adam] that therefore "no revival into life is to be looked for in their case." Suppose there is no revival principle *in* the *wicked dead*, is there any, abstractly, in the *righteous dead?* I think not. At the *voice* and *by* the power of the Son of God, ALL that are in the graves are to come forth, THEY that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, (not *life* simply, but "ETERNAL LIFE") and THEY that have evil, unto the RESURRECTION of damnation. John 5: 28, 29.

Now it does seem to me if any one will look closely at verses 48, 49, as explained above, they will see that they are the true *key* to understand *who* the apostle means in the expression "*resurrection of the dead*" in verse 42—*who* are to be raised corruptible and *who* incorruptible as brought to view in the scriptures of truth. So verses 21–24, are the *key* to understand who are embraced in the *same* and similar expressions in verses 12, 13, 15, 16, 21. In verses 21–24 he gives the order of the resurrection of ALL *the dead*; but in verses 42–44, he speaks *only* of the resurrection of the "dead *in* Christ" as already shown; and as is also evident from the following language, (verses 49, 51.) "As WE have borne the image of the earthy, WE shall also bear the image of the heavenly."—"Behold I show you a mystery, WE shall not all sleep," &c. This view then, takes the entire chapter from Universalists as proof of their erroneous doctrine; and also shows conclusively, in my estimation, that there will be "a resurrection both of the *just* and the *unjust*."

I will now notice your remarks on 1 Thess. 4: 16, which, in connection with Rev. 20: 6, I quoted to prove two resurrections. I can afford to admit all the force of your reasoning on the expression—"the dead in Christ shall rise *first*," as the quotation in Revelations, and other passages, remain untouched by the argument on *that* passage.

Though I am not convinced that the word "*first*" does *not* refer "to another class to be raised afterwards," yet my brother *may* be right in saying that it has reference "to the fact that the living saints would not go to meet the Lord, on his return from heaven, till *the dead in* Christ were *first* raised, so that all would go together;" but I think he is mistaken, when he says it has "reference *only* to the fact," &c. It *may* refer to *this fact;* and I have little doubt but that it also refers to a resurrection to take place afterwards. Though you say, "here is no idea of a *first resurrection*, and that Paul never speaks of *two* resurrections, except of *Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming:*" yet, if *two resurrections* can be proven from some other portion of the word of God, I think it just as fully settles the question, as though PAUL had been *very explicit* in enunciating the doctrine. But I leave it for my dear brother, and the candid reader, to decide whether I have not shown that Paul *has* positively taught TWO resurrections in the chapter we have at length, been considering. But you seem to admit, from your argument against a FIRST *resurrection*, that if such can be established, it follows necessarily that the wicked dead will be raised. But as I have already so extended my remarks, and being fearful of burdening your columns, I shall only glance at this point. I quoted Rev. 20; 6; as you did not notice it, I will quote it again with its connection, according to Murdock. "And I saw thrones, and [persons] sat on them, and judgment was given to them, and to the souls that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus and for the word of God: and these are they who had not worshipped the beast of prey, nor its image, neither had they received the mark upon their forehead, or on their hand: and they lived and reigned with their Messiah those thousand years. This is THE FIRST RESURRECTION. Blessed and holy is he, that hath part in this FIRST *resurrection:* over THEM the SECOND *death* hath no dominion." This language is so plain and positive in proof of a *first* resurrection, that it seems a work of supererogation to add anything by way of comment. Whatever bearing, therefore, the words—"*the dead in Christ shall rise* FIRST," may have in proof of two resurrections. I think there ought to be no misapprehension in regard to the import of the language above quoted as proving two resurrections. If the declaration, "*This is the first resurrection*," with its *connection* preceeding, is not deemed sufficiently conclusive, then by adding to it what follows in regard to the "*second death*," ought, in my opinion to settle the question. For if there is really a *second* death for the wicked, they *must* necessarily have a resurrection to *life*, in order to die *that* death. But if I remember right, Bro. Storrs does not attach much weight to this phrase "*second death*," because it occurs in the book of Revelations, and is supposed by him, not to be referred to in any other part of the Bible. Pardon me, my brother, when I say I think this is lowering that excellent and important part of the divine record, without sufficient cause. And here let me say by-the-way, that I think there is not sufficient proof that the passage—"But the *rest of the dead*" [meaning the wicked dead] "LIVED *not again until the thousand years were finished:*"—has been *added* by some one, to verse 6. There should be *most decisive proof*, of interpolation of the scriptures, before being allowed: as it opens the "flood gates" for men to call in question, on mere cavil, the genuineness of scriptures that militate against their cherished opinions. Is there not then as much evidence, and is it not as reasonable to suppose, that this *passage* was ommitted purposely, or more likely through mistake, in the Syriac version, *than* that it has been added, and that too probably by those who professed to revere the sacred oracles? I think so. Then I say the passage ought to be received as *genuine* until much better proof is produced that it is spurious. Receiving it therefore as genuine, it affords additional and indubitable proof of the resurrection of the *wicked dead*.

The words of Christ—"Thou shall be recompensed at *the resurrection of the* JUST," is also additional proof, if more were needed, of a *second* resurrection: for if there is but *one* resurrection taught in the Bible, and the saints *only* are to be subjects of *that;* it would be superfluous to say, "the resurrection *of the just:*"—it would be explicit and true to say "thou shalt be recompensed at *the resurrection.*" So here is more evidence of a particular and peculiar resurrection, "*the resurrection of the just*" as distinguished from the "*resurrection of the unjust.*"

I will notice one more passage on this point and submit it. Isa. 24: 21, 22; "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the *host* of" [i. e. the wicked who are lead by] "the high ones that are on high" [i. e. in high places] "and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together" [in the dust] "as

prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison" [house of death, *sheol*] "and after many days shall they" [*high* and low, kings and *all* that are wicked] "be visited" [by the voice and power of the Son of God, and shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation.]

But to come back to another point already hinted at. Is the "second death" brought to view in the Bible except in the *book of Revelation?* I think it is in many places, but I can only notice one or two passages. Ezek. 18 : 26, 27 ; When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them" [here is the *first* or temporal death] "for his iniquity that he hath done, shall he DIE" [*the second death.*] "Again when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, *he shall save his* SOUL ALIVE" [not from the *first* or *temporal* death, for *all* are subject to *this ;* but from the SECOND *death.*] Thus "the second death," as I believe, is here plainly announced ; if so, then ought not my intelligent brother to let the phrase, "*second death*" in Revelations, have its *full weight*, in evidence of the resurrection of the wicked ? But I close, and thus submit my arguments to the *careful* and *candid* consideration of the reader—hoping and praying that, although we may differ in our conclusions and not be able to see alike on this subject, we may possess in an eminent degree the spirit of our divine Redeemer, and have fellowship one for another and thereby honor God, and benefit the world.

Yours in the blessed hope,

H. H. HALL.

(See Response, page 72.)

NEW YORK CENTRAL COLLEGE.

IMMORTALITY.—THE SOUL.

FROM J. B. COOK.

Man made in God's image.

(Continued from page 56.)

THE curse reduces man, (and "the image" he is, or bears) to the dust ; "unto dust shalt *thou*" (the created man—the living soul—the image of his God) "return !" Gen. 3 : 19. Thus they are "*lost*" —as to any self-life, or power of redemption from death. But through Jesus—justification, sanctification, and glorification (at the resurrection of the Just) they are "*renewed*" *in* "*the image*" of God !

"*The sons of God*" are to be "manifested :" they will "partake of the divine nature !" They will "be *like* Him" who is "the *express image*" of the Most High ! 1 John 3 : 1–3 ; Rom. 8 : 14–30 ; Heb. 1 : 3. "Is it not written—I said : *ye are gods?*" John 10 : 35. Are not "the brethren joint heirs with Him" of whom Jehovah has said, "I will be to Him a Father and He shall be to me a *Son ?*" Heb. 1 : 5 ; 2 Sam. 7 : 14. Here is the "Image."

The objection of Prof. G. is thus shown to be founded in misapprehension and mistake !—in misapprehension of what the scriptures say of the *loss* that man sustained by sin :—in mistake as to the import of the word "image" at creation, and its restoration in Christ, and the divinely adopted "sons of God" by redemption, as it will be consumated in "the first resurrection." Most professors seem never to have read the Bible ; or else not to see the plain truth.

Prof. G. asks, in relation to man's creation ; "Shall this likeness and image of God cease ?"

Reply. No sir ! It will not cease. Not however because of an immortal man or soul in man ; but because God has *re*produced, stereotyped and glorified this "image and likeness" according to the gospel—by our Lord Jesus Christ.

Prof. G. affirms "the likeness" to God, in which man "was created" to be "an immortal likeness !"

Reply. This is said, I respectfully submit, in utter mistake, or in disregard of all the *facts* and scripture statements, which the subject embraces ! The penalty of sin was "surely *die*—unto dust shalt *thou* return—lest *he* put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat, and *live forever* (in sin) therefore He drove out the man" (that he had made in "his own image.") Gen. 3 : 22, 24.

The "*new* way"—the "living way"—the only way to God or "life and immortality," that is now possible for man, is by "Jesus and the Resurrection." He says "no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which grows in the midst of the Paradise of God." Heb. 10 : 20; John 14: 6 ; Rev. 2 : 7 ; 22 : 2.

Prof. G. argued man's immortal nature from the fact that he can "not live by bread alone, but by every word of God !" The beast is satisfied by eating, &c. Not so with man.

Reply. This allusion to man's need embraces considerations that should overwhelm any objector as by a mighty avalanche !

Man would *never* have lived "by bread alone but by every word of God"—by everything that God appointed. First it was by obedience, and access to the tree of life. From that he was cast out.—Now it is by faith in Jesus the new and *true* "way to life !" He must obtain *life*—"eternal life"—by the living word and the grace of God, or *perish.* John 3 : 16–31 ; 1 John 5 : 9–12 ; Rom. 6 : 21 –23 ; John 6 : 27–60.

Thus the revealed reason for making "*mortal* man" dependent on divine mercy in Christ for life, is now made the reason for asserting that he has never fallen—or *failed of life!* but that he still *has life*—"must *live.*"

However God says that "Death hath passed upon all"—"Bread alone" cannot preserve life, save "as a vapor." We may find this something *more* than "bread alone," in Christ : "He that hath the Son hath *life*"—the gospel's future "everlasting life." John 5 : 24.

Prof. G. asked, in order to show that the rich man and Lazarus were persons conscious in death, whether parables are not founded in *facts ?*

Reply. Yes sir ! But you must not *assume* the nature of the facts, so as to contravene the whole history of that era, and of man's mortality, as well as the whole plan of God for bestowing "immortality !"

The facts on which many parables were based, were the most important of that age—Jewish rejection and Gentile calling. "The rich man" is rejected and "buried;")as the *people* of Israel are described Ez. 37.) "The poor man"—the Gentile—is taken into covenant and favor—"Abraham's bosom—if ye are Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed."

"The rich man," (Judah) wanted favor for his "five brethren" (the rest of the tribes) but he was told that they "had Moses and the prophets—if they will not believe them, neither would they be persuaded though one should *rise from the dead!*" Thus the resurrection—the vital truth that dying men do *die*, and, when "dead," do need a "*Resurrection*" *from* that state, (at the last trump) is plainly taught! It is taught *here!*

The view of any parable that ignores this foundation, truth, and the great *facts* of that age, (to which many parables do, unquestionably, relate) is not entitled, to say the least, to much consideration.

Prof. G. said at two points "from all this we *approach an argument!*"

Reply. I respectfully submit that no one can "approach an argument" in a direction where it is *not!* Had the Professor been in the channel of Scripture and fact, he would have *had* the argument two hours ago!

Prof. G. said "the use of language decides its meaning;" hence he inferred his conclusion from the general scriptures he quoted.

Reply. Yes sir! The use of language taken in its connection, does determine its import. But *the sense* of terms depends on the character and habits of those who *use* it. Shakers and Swedenborgians, Baptists and Platonists, *use* language of their own, and *against the gospel.* But those who speak by inspiration (and those who fully believe them) *use* language that harmonizes with man's personal creation—his fall and present mortality, and his need of "redemption" by the Redeemer—including this vital doctrine of a resurrection to "immortality" and "incorruption!" "I *believe*, and therefore (so) speak."

THE BIBLE USE of language always recognises "man" as a mortal—a dying creature. It speaks of no "immortality" for man but on God's gracious plan—by "Jesus and the Resurrection." But Prof. G. has been unwittingly arguing directly against this "*use* of language" as found in the Holy Scripture. All classes who oppose the Bible "use of language" as to "death" and "the resurrection," make man superhuman—more than "*mortal*," and "the *dead*" more alive than the living; and none so much alive as those who have been longest "dead!"

Prof. G. admitted that the "living soul"—"*Nephesh chayah*" may be an animal—or "living creature," but he would not rely on one word of Scripture (as he thought I had done in quoting Gen. 2: 7.) Still he conceded my idea that the *roots* of ideas and of language found in Genesis, run through the whole scheme of Revelation.

Reply. This is just the ground taken by me—so far as it goes. The radical words and ideas, in "Genesis" have grown and grown till they have become THE BIBLE!—God's whole revelation to man! It is in itself a divine harmony—with all the facts from the world's creation to its "restitution!"

THE SOUL being the creature or person, and the "living soul" the "living (person or) creature," I argue that theBible does not *begin* or go on with these words in the Platonic or philosophic sense. Platonism and popery have no such ideas, or "*use*" of these terms; therefore I think that philosophic "*use*" of the words "*soul*" and "*spirit*" are Anti-Christian!

Prof. G. spoke of the "spirit of man as more than air or a breath. The Holy Spirit is not an holy wind," he said.

Reply. Yes; the breath is "the *breath of life!*" The human spirit is more than a human wind; but it is not an independent or distinct man. Hence, "if a *man die*" there is (so far as he is concerned) no living man till he shall "*live again.*" Job 14 "If the dead rise not, then they that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished"—of course they have not gone to Heaven. The place for those who "*perish*" is not Heaven!

Prof. G. said that there is *one* thing that links all accountable beings—even Satan himself—with God! This is conscience—which implies of course immortality, or a conscious responsible being.

Reply. This seems to have been assumed, with no shade of scriptural argument. For in perfectly sound sleep there is no real active conscience (though there is in disturbed, imperfect sleep.) In cases of swooning, also, and of depressions of the skull there is *life*—organic animal life—but no conscience—no memory—no sense any how of any responsibility! If so, the Professor is wrong.—Nay, more! He is not only wrong in assuming both premises and conclusion on a point so vital; but speaks in palpable contrariety to the Scripture. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that He might *destroy* the works of the Devil—destroy death and him that had the power of death, that is *the Devil.*" 1 John 3: 8; Heb. 2: 14. This "destroy" is not meant to sustain or preserve! They are not worth preserving.

Prof. G. said that the whole circuit of being will forever continue.

Reply. This statement is made against the 400 texts which teach the contrary. "The wicked shall not be—their place not be:" Ps. 37; Obd. 14; Mat. 3: 12; Rev. 20: 10–15; 21: 8.

Prof. G. said they must *live.*

Reply. God says, "the soul that sinneth it shall DIE!" Ezk. 18: 4. We read in. Isa. 26: 14, "They are dead, they shall not *live!*" But now we hear from the other side a voice—"they must live!"

Prof. G. quoted "the thief as an other spirit gone home to God" Luke 22. But he had not analyzed the language, nor noticed that the Saviour "had not ascended," (3 days after) nor that when Jesus did ascend, he went "*alone* within the veil." Heb. 9; John 20: 17; Acts 1: 9–11.

Prof. G. read Luke 12: 4, 5. But he seemed to forget that this is consistent with all that God says of his being "*able* to *destroy*" as well as "save" He says *destroy*, &c., hundreds of times; and this no vague or general text can deny. God's word is

truth." It does teach that man—living man, was "the living soul." That "the soul (or person) that sinneth shall *die*;" and that the righteous obtain "immortality at the last trump." 1 Cor. 15 : 49 –55. The opposite is not read, but *inferred* aside from the scriptures. True the Bible is vaguely *mis*-quoted by Papists, Pro-slavists, and even infidels; because it is, after all, "the *higher law*" to all, who dare appeal to it, even in a perverted form! But still the whole "tree" of truth harmonises with, and grows *out of*, the grand ROOTS in Genesis 1, 2, 3. It opposes all theories and interpretations that are not of itself: and so, according to the mind of its divine author, "the just live (not by theorizing; nor by speculating; but) by *faith*" —by believing what God has revealed of Jesus and salvation.

WE AGREE that the word of God "is *truth*."—John 17 : 17. The Professor commends my humble illustration of that assertion of the great teacher, Messiah.

WE AGREE further that the *truth* lies in the harmony of its statements with the facts in the case. It represents Jew, Gentile, and the church of God —sin, its cause and curse and cure—Jesus and his great salvation, God and man—time and judgment as they are, have been, or shall be! The Bible representation is not a congeries of riddles—not a great problem addressed to the intellect for solution; but rather *the solution* addressed to faith.

We should also agree, by a *logical necessity*, that when God says "*death*" for sin, in harmony with all fact, (all history, and through all time) we should believe that the first man, Adam, made in the image of his God, did *not* "live forever;" but that he did "*surely die*, and return to the ground"—thus "the word" does declare! This agrees with the gospel plan for raising "many of those that *sleep in the dust* of the earth." "As ye have borne the image of the earthy; (as did Seth) ye shall also bear the image of the heavenly"—in the resurrection, as did our Lord Jesus; 1 Cor. 15; Gen. 5 : 3.

We should agree, I think, that the opposing view, contradictory to the divine, is as false as its author. Protestants got it from the Papists! Papists did not originate it; but borrowed it from the Platonists, who, "regarding *Plato* as the *firmest prop of heathenism*," revived Platonism as "an *obstacle* to the triumphant progress of Christianity." Plato and his compeers in that "wisdom" which knew not God—sacrificed to devils;" and as they were of the "world that lieth in the Wicked One," they derived their doctrine from him who first denied God's word. He said, "ye shall NOT SURELY DIE." What "the Old Serpent" *said* in contradiction to God, the high priests and philosophers of heathenism did! (They did it in their imagination, I mean.) They deified their "*dead*;" "they changed the truth of God into a *lie*"—as did the Devil!

ALL CLASSES whose philosophy lies in the channel of Shakers, Swedenborgians, Papists, and Platonists, may find the fountain of their faith in Satan's first falsehood—"ye shall not *die*; but be as *gods*." Such scout the "resurrection," and most of them have no place for faith, repentance, baptism, (as Jesus taught it) or a life conformed to that of Christ.

THE TWO systems are as separate as Christ and Belial—the Gospel and Platonism—God and the Devil! Therefore there is, to me, no ground for doubt—there is no middle ground—there can be no compromise—"Choose ye whom ye will (believe and) serve—if the Lord be God, (and his word truth) then serve Him."

Prof. G. intimated that his friend (myself) would have nothing to say in reply, he said, "if he shall appear on the other side," &c.

Reply. There would be no "other side" (to us on this point) were we both on Bible ground. The Bible is but one divinely perfect whole. It has no "*other* side!" He alone has "*the truth*," who takes the one side or system given by God; which traces "the curse" and death to sin and Satan. But deliverance to God, by "Jesus and the Resurrection."

He is on "the other side" who thinks that "*the soul* that sinneth—the living soul" does "*not* die," and therefore is at death (as the Old Serpent said) "as the *Eloheim*." This, (in the Christian sense, and to the *Christian* mind) is "the other side," (in my humble opinion.)

The truth is expressed thus—"thou shalt surely die," (*moth tamuth.*)

The lie of the Tempter is, "ye shall *not* surely die," (*lomoth temerthun*—the same, only in the plural, with *not* added.) This relieves us from all the obscurity occasioned by incompetent criticism.—God's word is "*moth tamuth*." Satan's denial is *not* "moth tamuth!" Let all beware of this "OTHER SIDE!"—this "snare of the Devil." 2 Tim. 2 : 26.

My aim is not controversy, but to expose the Satanic "lie"—to honor Jesus, our only "way" to "*life*" in the future; and, by all the means of the gospel, to "*save some*."

From Catharine C. Williams.

Br. Storrs.—I send you a copy of a letter written to H. W. BEECHER last winter, on the occasion of his lecturing in *Elmira*, N. Y., at that time. Whether he received it or not I know not, as I have never heard from it. Although so great his fame, yet I remembered it took but a sling and stone to slay a giant, and therefore I thought there would be no harm to make an effort towards so desirable a result. The letter will explain itself. —C. C. W.

MR. H. W. BEECHER.—*Honored Sir.*—I am indebted to "the press" for the *little* I know of you, but though my acquaintance thereby is more limited than desirable, it is yet sufficient to inspire me with confidence to address you as a follower of *Him* "who was greatest of all, by being servant of all," and accessible to all. To us it is given, to look up to Him, adore, and imitate, as much as in us lies, but not like Him to know without learning; and it is some consolation to know that human kind are on a level in this respect; and knowing this I have presumed to speak to you on a theme, than which, none in my humble view can be of greater moment, or of greater conse-

quence that it should be rightly understood. The theme to which I allude relates to the government of God. What I wish particularly to call your attention to, is a statement by HENRY GREW, Philadelphia, which I saw in a periodical called the BIBLE EXAMINER, wherein you are said to have denounced the belief of *literal death*, instead of eternal life in misery, as the "wages of sin," or penalty of the law, as the rankest heresy.

I have learned from the source above alluded to, *viz:* the Press, that you are a lover of justice, mercy, and as a matter of course a friend of Liberty, a friend of the *friendless;* also that you were ranged with the gallant *few* who are seeking to break the chains that fetter thought, and investigation; therefore I need not fear to speak plainly what I feel so deeply, and would seem an anomaly, did I not know something of the power of habit, and prejudices of education, which I have reason to believe not even the most gifted intellects are exempted from. What but this almost resistless power could enthrone and deify as God—who is styled "the God over all, blessed for ever"—while believing at the same time, that those who rebel against him will by his almighty power be preserved in order to suffer torment unutterable, eternally, to punish them for the ills of this short life? What end, other than giving vent to feelings of most direful hatred and revenge, is attained thereby? Who of us love to be tortured, or to see others writhing in woful agony even though it be self-inflicted or the result of the sufferer's own wickedness, or folly? Not that I feel disposed to complain of the righteous judgments of God visited on the wicked, such as the history of the world records—resulting in their destruction; but on the other hand, are we not glad when the poor slave ceases to feel the cruel lash? The beast the cruel treatment of his master? And shall human sympathy transcend the divine? Thus it would seem, in the light these things are commonly viewed.—How can one be silent when such a God is held up to view as a Being worthy to be adored and obeyed? Who of us would dare, or wish to treat enemies thus did we have the power? especially if we were so far above them as to be in no wise affected by their enmity? While so many are from time to time listening to so many things for their instruction from your lips, must these dreadful views of God and his government continue to be sanctioned by you? May it not be possible there is some misapprehension somewhere? Is it safe to believe the evidence of our senses, especially when corroborated by inspiration? The Bible says, the "Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground"—not a *case* to put the man in—and he became a "living soul" by the inspiration of the "breath of the spirit of lives;" (mar.) Is it not just so now? And do we not find death just what God said? "dust *thou* art and to dust *thou* shalt return." Why unwilling to have it so? And if any agency is employed to hold any thing together, shall we confound the bond with the thing bound? Thus, the "breath of life," or "of the spirit of lives," or, if you please, the spirit that at death "returns to God who gave it," causes us to become living souls. Now, can that cause ever become the effect? Can we be "living souls" after that which makes us such is taken from us? Why should the thought that in a little while the wicked shall not be, be any more revolting than that a short time ago they were not? The thought that God will perpetuate eternally the existence of those who will be a curse to themselves and others, as long as they have any being, does not seem to reflect much credit on the attributes of Him who can not err. So it seems to me, at least, on reflection, and especially so after he has so repeatedly taught us to expect the contrary, concerning their end, in the various comparisons he instituted between the wicked and things that are most perishable; such as chaff, withered branches, fish cast on dry land, &c. &c.; as though he would not have us mistake the way the incorrigible would be disposed of, as unfit to answer any good end by living, and would therefore be regarded as worthless, as we do those things he has compared them to. "If ye live after the flesh ye shall *die*," says Paul;—and yet, believing this, you class with the National sin of Slavery, I learn.—The good die too, I well know; but Him who is able, has said, "I will raise such up at the last day," as also Paul testifies, when he assures us, "our lives are hid with Christ in God, and when Christ our life appears we also shall appear with him in glory;" and as death is abolished, (virtually) we need not consider that in the way of our future life, but trust that in due time these promises will be performed. I can only account for the light in which these things are generally viewed but by looking abroad amongst all ranks of mankind, and observing the almost universal tendency to imbibe any current notions, as they do the milk that nourishes them, without a question, and like their nutriment, seems to become a part of them. For proof of this, we have only to look at the various heathen, and Catholic nations of the globe, and mark with what tenacity they cling to the most revolting notions and customs; seemingly clinging most devotedly to those things most repugnant to reason. Should not a knowledge of this fact lead us to look well to matters of such momentous interest to all? And should we not be willing to pause, and suspend our belief (I will not stop here to ask how we came by it) in this mighty puzzle, at the first intimation that it may be a fiction, before presuming to persevere in reversing the decree, "dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return," by telling the wicked, "nay, not so—you will live, and sin, and suffer, as long as eternity endures?" I know how these things are got along with, and what the *thou* is made to mean, and what death is made to mean too; and to my sorrow, I know too, how God's system of government looks viewed through this medium. With gratitude, I may say, now, to my joy, I know how it seems to feel that God does not mock when he says, he does not want the wicked to die, "but rather that they would turn and live"; but if they will not, "the soul," (or person) that sins, and will not turn and do that which is lawful, and right, shall die, "for the wages of sin is death"; and may the joy of taking God at his word, believing and teaching the same, rather than that death means life in misery, ere long be yours.

In conclusion, allow me to ask, does it not transcend the commission of Him who declared himself to be "the way, the truth, and the life," to teach, or give countenance to the system that teaches mankind have *life in themselves*—and only need *happiness* superadded—after he has said, that those that "believe not the Son of God shall *not see life*, but the wrath of God abideth on him"? It seems to me that the current idea of man's possessing an immortal nature, and that such a nature *can* sin, and suffer, only needs the same attention and investigation you justly bestow on other important subjects to see its inconsistency and fallacy. It seems fitting that one should feel concerned at seeing the mighty array united to uphold the only prop of Popery, by sustaining the notion of such a soul as alone calls for a Purgatory. May the only engine that seems potent enough to undermine the system, as well as Universalism, not fail of doing its work for lack of your support, is the humble and earnest desire of the subscriber,

CATHARINE C. WILLIAMS.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, MARCH 1, 1856.

From Henry Grew.

Dear Brother Storrs:—I am no advocate for any degree of punishment, unwarranted by the sacred scriptures, in order to deter sinful men from transgression. In what appears to me to be the truth on this important subject, I do see a salutary restraint on the sinner, which Respondent's theory annihilates.

Some writer on the passage—"It is appointed unto men once to die, but AFTER this the judgment"; remarks, "the last clause of my text, throws terror into the first." Although sinners can have no definite impression of the unscriptural dogma of interminable torment, they may some affecting sense and expectation of a future conscious judgment, in which God will deal with them according to the degree of their sinfulness, which may either check their sinful career, or, by the grace of God, induce their conversion to righteousness.

If the sinner can persuade himself that the first death is the end of him—that he shall never "appear before the judgment seat of Christ," or consciously meet an angry God, is it reasonable to suppose, that he will fear to add sin to sin, as much as if believes in a future conscious judgment when he shall receive "few" or "many stripes" according to his demerit? Has not the "fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation" of a holy God, beyond the grave, withheld the almost determined suicide from the perpetration of the rash act? Does not this awful expectation of a righteous future judgment, prevent many from terminating their present miseries by self-destruction? Respectfully submitted without enlarging as I could on this point.

Fraternally, yours, HENRY GREW.

Response to Bro. Grew.

We see no "restraint" arising from Bro. G.'s theory but what is equally as effectual by Respondent's. A punishment *certain* and *near* is far more effectual in restraining disobedience than one that is *distant*, and may be, for that very reason, *uncertain*. Besides, the punishment must be one that commends itself to a man's reason or judgment as right, and not needlessly severe. A petty schoolmaster may think to threaten to "*cut your ears off*" is a very "salutary restraint"; but the thinking scholar either does not believe he will do it, or he thinks him a barbarian, and looses all respect for him. He may dread him, but can never love or respect him.

"Sinners can have no definite" sense, if the threatened punishment is *death*—as Brother G. and ourself believe—of the justice of making them *alive* from the dead to torment and kill them again, any more than they can of "interminable torment." In principle and spirit they see no difference.—"When dead, why not let us remain dead?" they ask: "and why make us alive to torture us without a chance of asking or receiving pardon, when thus *made to see* God's justice?" "Surely," they say, "no reason can be assigned for this short and hopeless torturing that is not equally valid for a longer one: either is for no end of our improvement or that of others, and seem alike to be an act of simple revenge."

If *death*—a deprivation of all life—and the *certainty* of having no part in the *resurrection life*, will not operate as a *check* in the "sinful career" of wicked men, we have no faith that the idea of being made alive from the dead and tormented ten, twenty, a hundred, or a thousand years, then to be killed again, will ever commend itself to their consciences so as to produce "conversion to righteousness." Paul said to the contradicting and blaspheming Jews, Acts 13: 46; "Seeing ye judge yourselves unworthy of *everlasting life*, lo we turn to the Gentiles." He did not try the experiment of teaching them, so far as the record informs us, that they would be made alive from the dead, and beaten with many stripes "*beyond the grave*." No such sentiment did he ever utter, nor any other inspired teacher of Christianity. If they did, where is the utterance?

Whether "the fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, of a Holy God, beyond the grave," has ever withheld persons from committing "suicide," or not, may be a matter of doubt. One thing we know, so far as our *personal* observation extends, self-murderers have been, in a large majority of cases, persons who believed in the torments of the wicked "beyond the grave." Such doctrine was not potent enough to keep them from the "rash act" of *suicide*. Even if the fear of torments after death has prevented some from taking their own lives, it is no evidence whatever that such doctrine is true. What superstition is there that has not done the same thing? Purgatory, ghost stories, &c., have all had their influence on ignorant and superstitious minds: and if a *little* torment "beyond the grave" is so effectual in preventing "*self*-destruction," a great deal, yea, eternal torments ought to be expected to prevent more; and precisely in this way our opposers talk who reject the doctrine of the literal destruction of the wicked.

We are of opinion that the true doctrine of *Life and Death*, showing that there is no future life, at all, except through Christ; and that those who suffer the ills of this life, committing themselves into the hands of God through His Son, will certainly arise to a life, "beyond the grave," where sorrow, pain, disappointment, and trial will never come; and where our enjoyment and glory will be increased by the roughness of the way through which we have come to that life, would do ten thousand times more to prevent "self-destruction" and inspire hope, than all the preaching of suffering to be endured "beyond the grave": and it would have this mighty advantage, it would represent the love of God in such a light—in opening such a life for the wretched children of Adam—as would be likely to strengthen them to endure the heaviest storms of this life, in the confidence that that kind and gracious BEING, who had given His Son to show them the path to such a life, would cause *all things* to work together for good to them, if they love and obey Him.

To us no more terrible thought can be suggested than that of perishing like a beast—cut off from all hope of revival into life—never to see God, nor His Son, or holy angels, and the holy ones of Adam's race who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb: never to see the new and renovated earth—paradise restored, and all tears wiped away. The thought of missing the sight of all these things is one too painful to be endured; and no trials, no sorrows, persecutions, scorn, hatred of men, or slight by men, is too much to be endured to obtain the blessed vision of these glories to be revealed.

To any *sane* mind such considerations are ample to prevent "self-destruction"; and when reason has left its throne, *no* consideration however awful can prevent it. Some have believed themselves certain of the theological hell "beyond the grave," and have killed themselves that they might "know the worst of it at once."

Teach men that God has set *life and death* before them; and calls them, in infinite compassion, to "choose life that they may live": teach them that life itself would be a curse if they are out of harmony with the AUTHOR of life; and exhort them first of all things to become "reconciled to God" *through* "His beloved Son"; who "is the way, the truth, and the life"; and let them know God has "*no pleasure*" in their death; and show them "*God is love*"; and see if it does not save men from rushing into death as *self-destroyers*. If this will not do it, nothing can. So it seems to us.

Response to H. H. Hall.

[See his article commencing on first page of this Examiner.]

On the subject under discussion let us have all the light that can be had; we do not design, however, to follow Br. Hall in all his points; because if his *main* one is untenable, as *positive* evidence, then we conceive our remarks Jan. 15th are as likely to be the truth as the view of our beloved brother.

His main point is, that the preposition "*in*," verse 22, should be "*by*," and quotes Prof. Murdock's translation of the Syriac in defence of that view. Of the Syriac language we have no knowledge, and of course do not know but the Prof. has given a faithful version of it; if the translation had been *contrary* to the Prof.'s theory, we should not doubt its accuracy; but as it is contrary to Paul's language in the English translation, and contrary to it in the Greek also, we are not at all convinced by Prof. Murdock's translation; especially when it is most manifest he has in other instances translated under the influence of the popular theory.

Prof. Murdock is clearly on the side that *all* the dead are raised *immortal* and *incorruptible*; that *may* have influenced him to change *in* to *by*, in the text; as he must have been perfectly aware, that with his view, of the immortality of all the raised, their salvation was inevitable, if they were "*in* Christ"; hence, to escape such a conclusion, *by* is necessary. We venture the assertion that

in the Syriac original the same preposition is used in verse 22 that is used in verse 18, and that it is "*in* Christ" in both verses; and until Br. H. can show it is not, Prof. M.'s translation is not entitled to the least weight in this discussion. But if we were to admit that the preposition *en*—*in*—might properly be rendered *by*—which we do not in *this* case—still, nothing would be gained to the idea of its embracing any out of Christ; for none die *by* Adam except by a *union* with him, as his *children*; "*even so*" there must be a *union* with Christ, as *his* children, in order to be made alive *by* Christ. Death followed in consequence of the relationship to Adam the first. Life can only come by a relationship to Adam the second. By *union* with the first *all his* children *die:* by *union* with the second *all his* children are made *alive:* and "if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his"; and hence he follows only the state and condition of his *animal* parent, which is *corruption* without revival into life.

We now ask Br. Hall to take his *Greek* Testament, and see what preposition Paul uses for "*by*" and "*in*." Take verse 21. "For since *by–dia–*man came death, *by*—*dia*—man came also the resurrrection." Then verse 22. "For as *in*—*en*—Adam all die, even so *in*—*en*—Christ shall all be made alive."

Now if Paul meant *by*, in this last verse, why did he change the preposition? why not have used *dia*, as in the previous verse? why change to the same preposition he had used in the 18th verse—"fallen asleep *in*—*en*—Christ"? Paul repeats the same preposition in verse 23, "But every man *in*—*en*—his own order"; and again verse 31, "I have *in*—*en*—Christ," &c. Then take verse 57, "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory *through*—*dia*—our Lord Jesus Christ." Add to this the last verse, "Always abounding *in*—*en*—the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain *in*—*en*—the Lord." No countenance is given, in this chapter, of the apostle's using *en* when he meant *dia;* and the contrast in verses 21 and 22 makes it highly probable that he spoke of those *in*—*en*—Christ, verse 22, in direct reference to what he had said verse 18.

We might multiply examples from Paul's writings to show that he gives us no ground for concluding that he used *en*, in 1 Cor. 15: 22, for *dia*. Although the original prepositions have various significations, yet *in* is the first sense of *en;* and is so translated in Paul's epistles, so far as we have examined. We cannot therefore admit that we "*assume* that the words '*in* Christ' have the same meaning as the same words have in the expression 'asleep *in* Christ,' verse 18, and the 'dead *in* Christ,' 1 Thess. 4: 16." We think there is no *assumption* in the case: to *us* it seems *demonstration*.

In looking over Bloomfield's "Critical Notes" on the *Greek* New Testament, edited by Prof. Stuart, late of Andover Theological Seminary, we find a remark on 1 Corth. 15: 22, which, as he was a believer in the wicked being raised to life, is worthy of attention. He says:

"The meaning here is well expressed by Heydenr. as follows: 'Our *connection* with Adam brought us *death*, our *connection* with Christ, *life:* by the one we became subject to the dominion of death; by the other, being raised from the dead we shall be delivered from that dominion: the evils inflicted on us by the former will be entirely done away by the latter, and the ruin arising from the former, which sticks so close to the entire nature of all men, will by the latter be completely removed."

If such a position does not establish universal salvation, if applied to all, both righteous and *wicked*, we see not what language would do it. On the 23d verse, "But every man in his own order," &c., Bloomfield remarks:

"It is not agreed whether by *tagma*" [the word rendered *order*] "be here meant order of *time* or of *dignity*. But the *former* sense is preferable; the meaning being 'each at the time, and in the manner ordained of God'; namely, that Christ should rise *first* by *himself*, long before the rest; then at his second advent, *all true Christians: Oi tou Christou;* as Gal. 5: 24. The apostle says nothing about those who are *not* Christ's, the *wicked*. Those, we know, will be raised too, and, as it appears, last."

Here is a pretty frank acknowledgement; and, so far as *criticism* is concerned in the matter, demonstrates that *the wicked* are *not* included in *this* statement of Paul about the resurrection; it must be settled by some *other* scripture testimony if at all. And as to "*tagma*," Bloomfield admits that it may relate to order of *dignity*, though he thinks *time* is preferable. We think it relates to *dignity*, and so stated in our remarks Jan. 15. We gave no hint about the "different sects" constituting a difference in the resurrection: let the reader look again at our remarks Jan. 15, page 28.

If there is "a marked difference between *the dead* of verses 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, and *the dead* of verse 42," as Br. Hall thinks, we confess we are utterly unable to see it: and his paraphrase of verses 45—49 has failed to carry conviction to our mind of its accuracy: the apostle makes no such

exposition about the resurrection, that we can find, either in this chapter or elsewhere; but he does declare elsewhere that he labored and suffered "if *by any means*" he "might attain unto the resurrection of *the dead*": Phil. 3: 11.

As to Adam the *first*, we long ago became satisfied, that whatever might be true as to the resurrection of his *posterity*, his resurrection was an impossibility. A *personal* sinner, under a *positive* law, with a *definite* penalty—"thou shalt surely die"—which penalty admitted of no revocation, unless we suppose deception was practised upon him in the statement of the law. Besides, no promise was extended to him after his sin—no hope of his *personal* deliverance was held out to him—but on the contrary he was told by his Judge, distinctly, "Dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return." In his case there is not the slightest ground for faith that he will ever have a revival into life. He fell under his animal nature—lived after his animal nature—like an animal, and died as an animal: reaped corruption, and eternally remains under its power. Not one word is ever said of his faith, or of any ground of hope for him *personally*. This view of ours is no new one, as Br. H. will find by turning to BIBLE EXAMINER for 1852, page 187, where we went more fully into the subject.

What Br. Hall means by saying, "suppose there is no revival principle *in* the *wicked* dead"; and asking, "is there any, abstractly, in the righteous dead?" we hardly know. If he means "*abstractly*" from *union* with Christ, we answer, we know of no such "*righteous dead.*" A dead man considered "*abstractly*" from Christ is a *dead sinner*, because he has no connection with him who is the *Life Giver*. But the righteous have *union* with Christ; and dying, die *in* Christ: having his Spirit, *viz.*, the Spirit of God that dwelt in Christ without measure; so that "*If* the Spirit of Him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you": Rom. 8: 11. We cannot look at a *true Christian*, or righteous man, "abstractly": such a Christian does not exist, dead or alive. We are truly sorry to differ so entirely with Br. Hall in relation to the apostle's teaching 1 Cor. 15; but it seems it must be so: he cannot see as we do upon it, and we certainly cannot see as he does; but this difference we trust will not hinder either of us from having a resurrection to incorruptibility and glory.

If Bro. Hall supposes we admitted, if a "FIRST resurrection" could be established that "it necessarily follows that the wicked dead will be" made alive, he misunderstood us: we admit no such thing. Even if we were to admit that there are to be *two* resurrections, hereafter—which we do not—it would be no admission on our part that the second embraces the *wicked* dead. But we have not yet come to the point in this discussion where we think fit to discuss that topic.

We have given our opinion on the "second death" in our discussion with Br. Grew, in EXAMINER, Vol. 10, p. 301. As some of our present readers have not access to it we insert it here.

"To the question—'*What* and *where* is the *second* death if the wicked die only one death?'—it may be answered—'*What* and *where* is the *second* death' of 'death and hell' if 'death and hell' *die not* even *once*, certainly not *twice?* See Rev. 20: 14.—Here it is worthy of remark, that the phrase '*second death*' occurs nowhere in the Bible except in the book of Revelation: a book confessedly very *symbolical*. It is strange indeed if the interpretation put upon this phrase—that of dying a second time—is the true one, that no writer of the Old or N. Testament ever employed it, except in this symbolical book. But as it is employed nowhere else, we are shut up to that book itself to establish its meaning. 'As death and hell' pass into this 'second death' and do not die literally twice, nor symbolically but once, we have been led to think the phrase, being connected with the lake of fire, means simply, a total and irrevocable destruction, without any idea of twice dying.

"Even if this view is not satisfactory it might be contended that the phrase is fairly interpreted, to say that a death *with* a resurrection is the *first* death: a death *without* a resurrection is the *second* death: not a dying *twice*. But as one dies with a certainty to live again, and the other 'without hope' of life again, so one may fitly be called the *first*, and the other the *second* death. Not because the subject dies twice; but because there is such a difference in the death of the two clasess that the first does not die in the sense the other does. Thus there are *two* deaths in fact—one for the righteous, and *another* for the wicked. The death of the wicked, in the book of Revelation, is called properly 'the second death'—it is unlike the death of the righteous. The wicked are 'utterly destroyed' by their death; while the righteous by theirs only '*sleep* in Jesus' to wake again at his voice, when he shall return from heaven."

The foregoing words are all we need say, at this time, on the figurative or *symbolical* phrase, "second death."

On the genuineness of the phrase, "The rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished," Br. Hall has a right to his opinion as well as we. We are satisfied it is spurious, and of no authority whatever. It is not found in the oldest and best manuscripts of either the Greek or

Latin churches; and it is not in the Syriac: so that it seems to us, any doctrine that it is essential to support by such a text is a most doubtful doctrine.

We draw a conclusion just the opposite from Br. Hall from the words of Christ, "Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." The disciples of Christ, prior to his resurrection, were ignorant of any resurrection, as appears from Mark 9: 9, 10, where, when coming from the mount of transfiguration, Jesus charged them to tell no man what they had seen till the Son of man were risen from the dead. "And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another *what the rising from the dead should mean.*" They had no knowledge of the true idea of a resurrection from the dead; but our Lord taught them there should be a "resurrection of the *just;*" and that then he would reward them. We see no ground to infer from this text a "second resurrection," but the reverse seems to us the truth. Jesus shows that the resurrection life, is a *gospel privilege and blessing;* and, of course, is *peculiar* to the *just.* The resurrection of this class to life is spoken of "as distinguished from" *not seeing life*, which is the fate of the *unjust*; so it seems to us.

Br. Hall's reference to, and quotation of, Isa. 24: 21, 22, would seem to have no weight, in the question, but for the words he has inserted in brackets. By putting *sheol* in brackets, after "shut up in *prison,*" as if that was the original word for prison, some might suppose it is a text in point, but the original word here for prison is *masgair*—"*a lock-up place.*" Now we think the text has no reference whatever to the resurrection of the dead to life. Besides, the Prophet saith in the 26th chapter, of these "lords"—"*high ones*" —who "had dominion over us" * * * "*they* are dead, *they shall not live;* they are deceased, *they shall not rise:*" &c. And this he says, too, in *contrast* with the righteous dead: "*Thy* dead men *shall live,* together with my dead body shall *they* arise:" &c. Compare Isa. 26: 14 and 19; and when Br. H. will give us as clear and positive evidence that the wicked dead shall live again, as is here presented that "*they shall not live*" again, then we may feel our *doubts* removed, or be convinced it takes wiser heads than ours to reconcile conflicting texts: as yet, in all this discussion, we have not seen a text brought forward by the *affirmative* that raises the scale when Isa. 26: 14 and 19 are laid in the balance.

A few words on Ezek. 18: 26, 27, and we conclude. This text Br. H. thinks "plainly" teaches the "second death." Suppose we were to admit that it does: what then? Does that prove the man dies *twice* a literal death? We think not. But it does seem to us to prove that he comes under *the death* which is *irrevocable;* or, so to speak, he dies a *double death:* one from which there is no release, because he dieth *in his sins,* and is "holden with the cords" thereof. The righteous do not thus die. Their death is never called "the *first* or temporal death." They fall *asleep* in Jesus, and awake in the resurrection. Their death is altogether different from that of the sinner. The righteous die in *hope:* the wicked die without hope—unpardoned—condemned—in their sins; held in death by the law—unliberated; they "die *the death,*" emphatically: it is so unlike the dying of the righteous that it may with propriety be called *another death:* they are "twice dead," as Jude said some were who were *then alive;* which expression only denoted their incurable and hopeless state. So we think the expression Ezk. 18: 26, 27, and second death of Rev., means *hopelessly dead*—utterly destroyed, so that they shall live no more. We have no idea that either of these expressions has any reference to wicked dead men being made *alive* to be killed a second time.

While we are on this subject we will further express the conviction that there is no such idea in the phrase "second death" as that of *dying* a second time: and to "be *hurt*" of it does not necessarily involve the idea that it is connected with *pain.* We speak of things without life as *hurt* or injured The ground, a house, and many other objects having no life, may be *hurt, i. e.,* receive injury, whereby their value may be impaired or destroyed: and it may *hurt* the owner, *i. e.,* be a *loss* to him.

The church to which our Saviour saith, Rev. 2: 11, "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death," was a church that was bitterly persecuted; and he had exhorted them, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee *a crown of life;*" and adds, you "shall not be *hurt* of the second death." We apprehend the language is of the same import as that of Jesus to his disciples, Luke 12: 4, 5, and implies no more than that those who suffered for Christ and his cause, though they might be put to death by their enemies, should suffer *no loss,* in the end, for he would surely give them "*a crown of life,*" and thus they would be preserved from the death which brings eternal loss, hurt, or harm, to all who come under it and such would be their fate if they did *not* "overcome:" but if they did overcome such loss, hurt or harm would not befall them, as he would restore *them to*

life; while all others would remain under the power of death; a death—because unbroken by life—properly called *the second death*, in the figurative and symbolical language of the book of Revelation: it is unlike the death of the saints, who only fall *asleep* soon to *wake* again. Of the wicked it is said, "*Like sheep* they are laid in the grave; *death* shall feed on them" * * * "the grave being a habitation to *every one* of them:" * * * "he shall go to the generation of his fathers; *they shall never see light*. Man that is in honor and understandeth not, is *like the beasts* that perish." Psa. 49: 14–20, and margin.

But perhaps we have said more than we ought in reply to Br. H., as he informed us, at the outset, that he does not "*now* intend to write again on the subject," &c. He may be assured we esteem him none the less for his kind and frank dissent from our views on 1 Cor. 15, or any other texts. None of us yet "know but in part," and we can afford to differ, if it is done in love; as we are sure it has been, thus far, on all sides in this discussion.

Cultivation of Spiritual Feelings.

It is no easy thing to keep the heart right. The downward tendencies of our nature makes it hard for us to rise in spiritual being—to run and not be weary—to walk and not faint. This difficulty is greatly increased when we mistake the source of our strength, or the way in which the fire of spiritual feeling is kindled up in the soul. We may attempt to draw water from a cistern that has none in it, or we may try, like Newton, to light our candle with an extinguisher on it. Christ is the life of the soul, animating and moving it in all the ways of godliness. But how does he do this? How does he work this life in us? We are not left to guesses or surmises here. He sanctifies his people through his truth. It is by this that he lifts them up, and pours light into the understanding, and strength into the heart. It is by this that he deepens their humility, and increases their faith, and raises them up above the surface of a mere profession, cold and unproductive, and enables them to live, not like the trees in winter, stripped of their foliage, and with their life hidden in the earth, but to live in the ways of God—"in beauty clad, and with health in every vein,"—living to him in all they do.

We have something to do, therefore, in the attainment of this strength. We must act rightly if we would have this spiritual life. We must regard the laws of mind in this matter. Pious feeling is awakened in the soul, only, by the contemplation of that which is suited to awaken such feelings. The heart is affected through the intellect—through its action. "While I was musing," says the Psalmist, "the fire burned." "Mine eye," exclaims the weeping prophet of Israel, "Mine eye affecteth my heart." This indirect control is all that we have over the world of feeling. The man who cannot produce a quicker circulation of the blood by simply willing it, can determine to take a medicine that will produce that effect. So the man who wishes to excite or allay any particular feeling, while he cannot bid it exist or cease to be, can fix his mind on considerations which will bring about the desired result. Here, then, we have a fundamental principle in mental philosophy. Feeling of any kind is awakened, only, by the contemplation of that which is calculated to excite it. This is a law of man's moral nature. It is just as uniform, and as far beyond the reach of an exception, as any law in the material world. We may, therefore, just as reasonably expect that the law of gravitation will cease, and that the stones of the street will fly upward, as to imagine that feeling will exist in the soul without its thinking upon that which is suited to produce it. Without this musing, the fire will not burn. Without this thinking, we cannot mount upward. We only dream of flying, and forget, as Coleridge remarks, that those who dream of flying, fly only in their dreams.

This great principle of our intellectual and moral nature may be easily tested. A man wishes to have deep spiritual feeling. He desires, for example, to feel deeply penitent—to sink down in dust before God. Well, this feeling will not kindle up in his soul at his bidding. Nor will its fires burn within, as the consequence of his musing upon any or every theme of meditation. The pages of a romance, the columns of a newspaper, detailing the state of trade or the condition of the money market, will not excite it.—Dwelling on the pleasures of sense—on scenes of earthly delight, will not call it forth, and for the plain reason that these things are not suited to produce it. They have no tendencies to awaken such feeling. They turn the mind away from those considerations through which God is wont to work repentance in the soul, namely its action in reference to God. To have this feeling he must take a very different course. He must fix his mind upon himself—upon his true condition. He must look at God's character in contrast with his own—at his goodness to him, and at his own action in return—at the law of God, which is holy, just, and good, and at the long, dark catalogue of his transgressions of that law. These are the considerations which are suited to affect the heart, and these are the musings through which God is wont to work in us that repentance which is unto life, and that brokenness of heart which is the acceptible sacrifice. It is through such meditation and prayer that we reach the dust before God, for it is through such action on our part that he works in us the feeling of repentance.

Again a man wishes to feel more love to Christ—to have his bosom swell with holy fervor—with emotions for a higher gratitude, and a warmer zeal in his service. Well, sighing for this will not produce it. Simply praying for it will not cause it to exist in the soul. No, not at all. The mind must be fixed upon that which is suited to awaken such feeling. He must fix his thoughts upon the cross of Christ—upon the High One, suffering, dying, for him. He must muse upon Gethsemane

and Calvary; must judge, with Paul, "that, if one die for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them." It is in such things that the love of Christ constraineth. In such musings is it that,

"The heart grows warm with holy fire,
And kindles with a pure desire."

Yes, is is when his "dear cross" is brought before the mind that the "eyes are melted into tears." Looking, then, to Jesus; beholding the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world, is the way to have the heart burn within us with love and devotion to him. We respect the laws of the physical world in our action for physical results. We do not attempt to warm the body by sighing for it, or to recruit its wasted energies by simply willing it. We do not say to the body, "Be thou clothed, and be thou strong." We use means suited to the ends we wish to gain. So we must act in spiritual things. We must seek to call forth and sustain pious feelings in the soul, by keeping before the mind that which is calculated to produce such feeling. We must muse on the things which are above, if the life and the power which are from above are to be ours. The thoughts must be on heaven, if the heart is to be there.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

The Gentleness of Christ.

The prophet Isaiah, in speaking of Christ, as a conqueror, says: "He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench; he shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law." In accordance with this beautiful conception of Christ, does the Apostle speak in the beginning of the 10th chapter of his second epistle to the Corinthians: "I Paul myself beseech you by the *meekness and gentleness of Christ.*"—And all this harmonizes with what Christ himself says: "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls."

The vision of Elijah in Horeb furnishes a striking illustration of divine power so exerted. First a great wind rent the mountain and the rocks; next an earthquake shook the ground; then a devouring fire raged before the eyes of the prophet; but the Lord was not in any of these. With all their power and terror they appear not to have affected the heart of the prophet; but after they had all passed, and nature was hushed in silence, a still, small voice fell upon his ear, thrilled his heart, and caused him to cover his face with his mantle. This was God, and we may say was symbolic of the gentle but subduing power characteristic of Christ. So Christ always acted. When he stilled the tempest, he did not strive nor cry, nor lift up his voice. Weary with his journey, he had lain down to take rest in sleep. Though th elittle vessel that bore him and his disciples was tossed by the waves and in apparent danger of destruction, he slept on securely. To those who knew him not he must have appeared all unfit to struggle with the difficulties and dangers of that terrible hour! But when call is made—"Master! carest thou not that we perish?"—he, rising in his majesty, calmly contemplates the fury of the elements around him, and in tones of gentleness, spoke to the raging winds and boisterous sea—"Peace, be still!" Instantly there was "a great calm." Calmly as he spoke, there was in his words an awful power, and so they who heard him *felt*, for "they feared exceedingly, and said one to another, What manner of man is this, that even the wind and sea obey him." They felt as Elijah did when he heard the "still, small voice."

So does Christ act in his dealings with his people. So does he enter their hearts, and influence their lives. He feeds his flock like a shepherd; gathers the lambs with his arms, and carries them in his bosom, and gently leads those that are with young. His whole life, as recorded by the Evangelists, is an exemplification of this; and the experience of all who give themselves up to his care and control, is a realization of this. O, that his people had more of his gentleness! Then would we have more peace, more purity, more progress in the church. Then should we flow together, and our hearts be enlarged; and then would Zion put forth her power and appear in her beautiful garments.

The world, which is regardless of wind, earthquake and fire, stands awed and subdued at "the still, small voice"—the same gentle voice that spoke to the tempest, that Elijah heard on Horeb, and that Mary heard when she sat at the feet of Jesus. And when the church learns better the language of the Master, and manifests more of his spirit, then may we look for those happy days of grace and power, when Christ "shall set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law."—*Preacher and United Presbyterian.*

Baptized for the Dead.

"Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they thus baptised for the dead?"

An Eastern periodical of high literary merit, is said to contain an article on this subject. Every commentator can tell us something about the difficulties which the critics have had with it. "The learning and labor expended on it have been immense," says one. But may there not have been a needless expenditure? May not the solution of the difficulty be found in the context itself? We ask with all modesty, as becomes us, when so many have thought otherwise.

When the question still in his mind, while he farther explains it, and deepens its import, the apostle goes on to say, "Why stand we (we apostles and preachers of the word.) in jeopardy every hour?" He then solemnly protests, "I die daily." This he explains by alluding to the imminent hazard of life to which he was exposed at Ephesus. But this was only a sample of his "perils." When he was baptized, it was with the full understanding that he was to wend his weary way amidst "perils" at the very mention of which flesh and blood might well quail; and that finally he was to be "offered" on the sacrifice and service of the

faith of those for whose salvation he labored.—Thenceforward he was to regard his mortal life as nothing;—"Neither count I my life dear to myself."

When the sword of persecution throughout the entire extent of the Roman Empire, awoke against the followers of Christ, and especially against the preachers of the Gospel, it cannot for a moment be doubted, that many others were baptized under similar circumstances. They were baptized for dead men; they were as if they were dead; as persons who might be regarded as good as dead; or all one as dead; as the Egyptians were "all dead men" on the night when the first born of their land were slain; and just as the forlorn hope of an army may be regarded as devoted to death, when they are led forth to storm a redoubt bristling with cannon. In view of this, the question might well be asked—If the dead rise not, if there is no resurrection of the dead—no future reward which more than compensates the loss of this mortal life—why are they baptized? Why present themselves as distinguished marks for the shafts of the persecutor? Why come under an obligation which requires them to face death? or makes them in the view of others "dead men?" Do they act rationally? The true philosophy would be, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow (soon) we must die" at any rate; and why shorten our brief span of feasting and rejoicing for nothing?

If we wish to be still more careful, lest we do violence to the preposition *hyper*, let us keep in view, what was very probably present to the mind of the Apostle, that still, when new converts received the ordinance of baptism, they stepped forward to *fill the place* of others who had fallen in the field of battle, as when one serried rank is swept away by the fire of the enemy, another marches forward to take its place, and leave their bodies on the bodies of their slaughtered comrades. They are baptized *in the room of*, that they may be, *instead of* their predecessors. And there is no need, either for the *conjecture* of Greenfied, or the *supplement* of Bloomfield.—*Pr. and U. Pres.*

From Catherine C. Williams, Shell Rock, Iowa.

We give the following as an introduction to Sister WILLIAMS, who has been a long and firm friend to the truths we advocate; and in hopes it may lead to an acquaintance with other friends in that far-off region.—ED. EX.

January 1st, 1856.

Br. Storrs:—It may not be uninteresting to you to know something of our journey, &c. We left Chemung Co., N. Y., the latter part of Oct., but on account of hindrances, did not reach our destination till the last day of Nov. We went by R. R. to Rock Island, Ill.: from there to our place is 150 miles. From thence, our goods were carried or drawn by oxen, in covered waggons. It was slow getting along, and rather tedious, as it was so late; but we were pretty well prepared for it, and did not suffer much. We found better roads and better accomodations than I had anticipated: and I was surprised to find, what I expected was a country with here and there a lone hut only, about as thickly settled as the same distance in some portions of our eastern states; so that we found no trouble in finding a place to stay nights, and enough to live on; while the people generally seemed hospitably disposed and satisfied with the country. We all arrived in safety and health to the spot we call *home;* and we are all here in one of the houses of the country—consisting of one room made of logs. We have only been here long enough to get so we can make out to *stay*, but we stay, and that too, without being involved in that great want of many parts of this fine country, *viz:* wood; which would be a great want indeed were we as many miles from timber as many are. It is, and has been very cold for the last fortnight or three weeks, with but little snow; but we have wood near, and there is plenty to live on. Wheat is $1.15 cts, corn 30; and other things accordingly: so, after we get started, I am in hopes we shall get along. We have now for the first time a farm of our own. It cost between 5 and $6 per acre: contains 140 acres—20 under improvement. There is room here in this country, for a great many of what I should think must be suffering ones of your city.

We are in a lone spot now, 40 rods west of a fine stream—the *Shell Rock*, which must be forded to get on to the main road running near its eastern bank; but 'tis settling fast. Saw-mills, flouring-mills, and such like conveniences are of easy access and near; and judging from appearances &c., I should think we were in a country that bids fair, at no distant day, to attain to a good degree of prosperity. I admire the prospect in its winter dress. Spring and summer must greatly improve it. But of the people, and religious prospects, I know but little. What the future will develop I know not; I hope however there is something in its elements not unfavorable to the rooting and growth of righteousness and truth. But of this hereafter.

From Clamor Frank, Ohio.

Bro. Storrs:—I am intensely interested in reading, every alternate week, your valuable paper, the "BIBLE EXAMINER;" and am only sorry that I have not, from my childhood, known the glorious truths which it advocates. The truth that Jesus, the Messiah, is our *only* Life-giver, outweighs, to my mind, all the traditions of men about natural immortality, etc. I am, under God, greatly indebted to you for the light which I have on the subject. Your "*Six Sermons*" and the "*Bible vs. Tradition*" have been excellent helps to me in its investigation. May the Lord greatly bless you to spread the Life-giving truths for many years to come, if it be His will, is the humble prayer of

Yours, in bonds of love.

ELD. JACOB BLAIN, *Buffalo*, N. Y., wishes us to say that he "shall be detained at home till in April."

CORRECTION.—*Dear Brother Storrs*: If you will please to refer to Respondent's article in EXAMINER No. 2, pp. 25, 26, you will see that the words "*in Respondent's opinion*," are not there. Had they been, as his remarks state, the correction would not have been necessary.

HENRY GREW.

RESPONSE.—If the *words* "'in Respondent's opinion,' are not there" the *spirit* of them *is there*. Thus:—"Br. G. now admits *by giving up* 1 Corth. 15 : 22." Respondent did not say, Br. G. *admitted* it in any other way or sense.

EXTRA EXAMINERS.—Our friends sometimes send for *extra* papers containing particular articles. We presume they are not aware that a compliance with their request is just the same to us as giving them the *whole volume*, as an entire set is broken, and the remaining numbers are useless: we have done it in a few instances, but we must decline it altogether hereafter. We print a uniform number at each issue, and must not answer requests for *extras* unless the whole volume is ordered. These remarks do not refer to subscribers whose papers never come to hand; such we supply, when informed of their loss, though we lose a whole set thereby: yet we expect them to apply at their Post Office carefully before complaining of not receiving their papers. Where several papers go to one Post Office it is next to impossible but that all arrived there if any did. By our system of mailing, one name could hardly be omitted.

LOST MONEY.—Money sent for the EXAMINER, *enveloped and directed* as we have stated in our previous numbers, is at *our risk*. If the person sending does not receive the paper, after a reasonable time for it to arrive, he should notify us. We have received six such notices already; so that we have paid a pretty severe tax for Post Office *delinquencies*.

BOOKS.—We have received from JOHN P. JEWETT & Co., Boston, through *Sheldon, Lamport & Blakeman*, of this city, the two following works:—

"THE HEATHEN RELIGION *in its Popular and Symbolical Development*: By Rev. Joseph B. Gross." This work must be interesting to those who wish to be informed on the subject of which it treats. Price $1.

"SABBATH EVENING READINGS *on the New Testament. St. John.* By the Rev. John Cumming, D. D., F. R. S., minister of the Scotch National Church, Crown Court, Convent Garden, London." The known reputation of the Author will excite interest to read it. While we could not indorse all the sentiments it contains we find much that is interesting and profitable.

WELLCOME'S TREATISE on Matt. 24 and 25, noticed in the last EXAMINER, Eld. D. T. TAYLOR says, "Is the best work on Matt. 24th and 25th I have ever seen. It is truthful, stirring, perspicuous, adapted to convince, and not lengthy; just the kind of books needed for the times. I hope it will be circulated widely."

WE have often spoken of the work of DR. MCCULLOH on the *Credibility of the Scriptures*, and have regretted that it should have no wider circulation. Narrow-minded persons who have become incurable bigots, and are too indolent to think beyond their creed, and who have left their thinking on that to their priest, may not like the work spoken of; but those who wish for an enlarged vision, and desire to be well prepared to meet the Deistical and Atheistical philosophy that bids likely to overwhelm the theological establishments which have had their foundation laid in the days of the church's apostacy and priestly corruption, will find Dr. MCCULLOH'S work a mighty *help*. It is in two octavo volumes, of more than 500 pages each, at the low price of $2 the set, filled with such vast and valuable information as is not to be had often. The postage, *prepaid*, is 54 cents; but those sending us $2.50 shall have the work free of charge, if sent a less distance than 3000 miles.

OFFICE OF BIBLE EXAMINER.—We feel it necessary to curtail our expenses; and we see no point where we can retrench better than to give up our present *office* and do our work at our residence; and until we shall see our way open to resume an office in New York city we shall occupy a part of our dwelling, 62 HICKS ST., *Brooklyn*. We are aware this is not as convenient for our friends who wish to call on us, but they must be contented to share a little of the inconvenience with us. We are but a short distance from *Fulton Ferry*.—Friends in New York who *call* for their papers will find them, as heretofore, at 141 Fulton Street, first floor, at DR. MCALLISTER'S, till further notice. All letters to us should be addressed the same as before, *viz*: "GEO. STORRS, *Editor Bible Examiner, New York*."

ELD. J. B. COOK expects to preach in *Philadelphia*, Sunday, March 9th.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, MARCH 15, 1856. NO. 6.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"IMMORTALITY OF THE WICKED."

Rev. S. Comfort, of the Methodist E. Church, has an article of some three columns in the *Northern Christian Advocate*, of Jan. 2d, on this subject. His article is interesting as one of many, which are appearing about this time, which go to show that notwithstanding they all talk about the weakness of the question, on our part, they have their fears it may spread, unless they put forth their power to suppress it. They are quite sure it can't live long—it never has, they tell us, and they are sure it never can. Very well, gentlemen; if it *can't live*, let it die; the sooner the better. Mr. Comfort opens as follows:

Nearly all important questions respecting the human soul may be comprehended under these three: Its *origin*, its *nature*, and its *duration*. We propose to cast a hasty glance at each of these respectively.

A tolerable beginning; but before he attempted the work here laid out, we think, he would have done well to have established the fact—if it be a fact—that there is any such *existence* as he and his school call "the human soul." To undertake to show the *origin*, *nature*, and *duration* of that which has no existence, except in men's imaginations, may be a splendid fancy exhibition, but it is building on the sand. Such an effort may dazzle superstitious minds but cannot convince a thinking one. Our friend proceeds to take up his subject as he has laid it out, as follows:

1. The *origin* of the soul. On this point three hypotheses have been advocated. First, that of *pre-existence*. Those who maintain this hypothesis, denominated *pre-existioni*, claim that God at the beginning of the world created the souls of all men; but they urge the soul is not united to the body till after each individual is born into the world. This theory was advocated by several Grecian philosophers, some of the ancient Jews, and was endorsed by some of the primitive Christians, and by Christian mystics in both ancient and modern times. The last and only treatise within our knowledge based upon it, is a late work by Rev. Dr. Beecher. It is a theory, however, which in spite of this talented but fanciful writer, is destined to keep its place among other equally mistaken notions of antiquity, which in all probability, would never have constituted any part of the dreamy speculations of modern times, had they not floated down the stream of time from a cruder age, and thus first suggested themselves to modern, but not always original thinkers.

2. A second hypothesis is, that the soul is created when the body is born or begotten. The advocates of this theory have been called *Creationi*. Some Christian fathers, both Greek and Latin, are said to have maintained this doctrine. It was adopted by Pelagius, and pressed into service in support of his favorite doctrine respecting depravity, in the support of which it seemed to lend important aid. It has had advocates in the Romish Church; and while Luther chose to leave the question undecided, Melancthon is said to have accorded to it his suffrage.

3. The third and last hypothesis assumes the propagation of the soul. This theory makes the soul as well as the body of the offspring to be derived from the parent. Those who have held this doctrine have been called *Traduciani*. This theory has had the suffrage of the Church in the West or Occidental regions more than in the Oriental. It affords the most ready solution of the doctrine of depravity; and has consequently been more generally held by modern orthodox theologians. Richard Watson favors it, and thinks it best accords with the teachings of Scripture which represent Adam as "begetting a son in his own likeness." All we shall stop to say is, that while each of these hypotheses is open to objection on one ground or another, that of *traduction* is probably encumbered by fewer than either of the two preceding. Indeed we do not see how the above statement of Moses can be made to harmonize with the *pre-existent* or the *creation* hypothesis.

We have here given all that friend Comfort has said on this topic; and he has shown one thing conclusively, *viz:* That neither he nor his fellow-theologians know anything about the fancy soul whose *origin* they labor in vain to find, because it has *no origin* nor existence. If he had undertaken to find the *origin* of the "*living soul*," which the Lord God made, Moses could have answered him in few words, *viz:* "The Lord God formed man of *the dust* of the ground, and breathed into

his nostrils the breath of life and *man* became a living *soul*." Gen. 2 : 7. This living soul God gave power to propagate his likeness : and all the living souls of Adam's race proceeded from the first pair that God made. But as friend Comfort has, with his fellow-laborers, become lost in a theological speculation, it is no wonder they are all "encumbered" with "objections," so that he is left to take the theory that has the "*fewer*," instead of submitting to the solid basis found in the Mosaic account of the living soul. Mr. Comfort next speaks of the nature of the fancy soul. He says :

The *nature* of the soul has been resolved on the two following hypotheses. First, that it is material—not indeed in the grosser sense of the term ; but in a sense the most refined and restricted. Next, that the soul is *immaterial*, a *pure spirit*, having none of the properties of matter. Which of these views is most entitled to our suffrage, is the question to be decided. But in coming to a decision it must be remembered that we are totally ignorant as to the essence of both matter and spirit. We know matter only by its sensible properties. But having no senses to discern the properties of spirit, we are compelled to proceed by a sort of negative process, separating from it these several properties which our reason teaches us, from our conceptions of its nature, are incompatible with that nature. We describe matter by asserting some of those properties which we have ascertained it possesses. In describing spirit we proceed differently, and describe certain properties which we conceive incongruous with its nature, and which it cannot possess.

Left to choose between these two alternatives, we cannot hesitate to pronounce the soul a pure spirit. And as all known subsistences must be classified with material objects, pure spirits, or a class of existences which combine the nature of both, we are reduced to the *trilemma* of placing the soul in one of the three classes. For our own part we cannot hesitate to assign it a place with purely spiritual existences. We see no reason why the soul does not rank with angels in nature, who the Psalmist declares are "spirits." Hence the celestial and the terrestrial meet in man's compound nature. In his soul he is identified with angelic natures, in his body with animal natures. Hence he forms the connecting link between the celestial and the purely terrestrial.

If his identification with angels is conceded, it will furnish a clue to the right answer to our second and third main questions. It will help us to determine as to both the nature and duration of the human soul. If the soul identifies with angels and they are spirits, it follows that being a spirit it is consequently placed at a vast remove from all the properties, and at an equal remove from all the accidents of matter. It is not subject to dissolution —cannot be reduced to its elements, because it has none ; it is a simple substance and is not composed like matter of a certain aggregate of elements in combination. It is subject to none of the laws of matter. In this, then, it differs from all material subsistences ; they contain the seeds of their own dissolution : whereas the soul is essentially indestructible and imperishable.

One truth, we judge, our friend has uttered, *viz ;* "We are totally ignorant as to the essence of both matter and spirit." If he had added, "We are totally ignorant" of man's possessing such a soul as he wished to describe, he would have uttered another truth which would have saved him all his labor, and he would not had to own that he was "compelled to proceed by a sort of *negative* process," under the teachings of his "*reason*," without one ray of light from revelation ; no, not a solitary text from the Book of God has our friend produced in support of his imaginary *soul*. He does not see "why the soul does not rank with angels in nature, who the Psalmist declares are *spirits*." He might as well have said, he did see why it does not rank with God in nature ! It is all a pure *assumption* without one item of proof. Suppose angels are *spirits*, what does he know of their *nature ?* Just nothing at all. Besides, it is not till "that world" is "attained" by a "resurrection of the dead," that those who are "accounted worthy" of that honor, are to be "as the angels of God :" See Math. 22 : 30 ; and Luke 20 : 35, 36.

Saith our friend C., "If his [man's] identification with angels is *conceded*, it will furnish a clue to the right answer to our second and third main questions : it will help us to determine as to both the *nature* and *duration* of the human soul."

The "identification" is *not* "conceded" by us ; and we affirm it is an unscriptural, and an unauthorized assumption. It is begging the whole question. First prove that *the man* the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground has any such *entity* as you call the soul—that any such *addition* was made to the dust formed man. When you have accomplished that task then it will be time enough to talk about its identification with angels : till then all your assumptions pass unheeded as the idle wind, and baseless as any other phantoms.

We must commend our friend for one frank acknowledgment. His fancy soul "cannot be reduced to its elements, *because it has none*." That is a truth, friend C ; and "it *has none*" because it is nothing—it is a phantazma—a mere creature of the imagination ; and we hardly know as it is idolatry to worship it, as its advocates seem to ; for it is not the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath"—it is *nothing*—has "no elements." There we might leave it, but we mean to give our friend a fair chance to speak in the EXAMINER ; hence we let him proceed. He says :

This brings us to the last, and which is the main question in this inquiry—the *duration* of the soul. Our position is this, that while the soul remains in nature what it is, *it cannot but exist.* In its very *nature* it is *immortal.* God has made it immaterial. It is thus placed at an infinite remove from the possibility of impairment, destruction, or decay. By its Maker's own hand it is conditioned as far from the possibility of destruction, as non-existence is from existence. It could not bring itself into existence: so neither can it extinguish the unquenchable flame of its own being. An act of Omnipotence originally gave it being, and nothing short of the same Omnipotence can abridge or terminate that being. Hence, it must first be shown that God will do this under given contingencces; or, in the absence of such evidence, the fact remains undisturbed that the soul must still trace on and on the endless line of its deathless being.

Here is a string of assertions and assumptions, without one particle of proof; and those who have been in the habit of taking declamation for argument will doubtless take it all for sound logic. However, as "Omnipotence gave it" (this fancy soul) "being," Mr. C. has to admit that "Omnipotence can abridge or terminate that being!" Our friend need not suppose we shall attempt to set Omnipotence to work to destroy nothing; *alias*, C.'s fancy soul. He goes on:—

This brings us to the specific point in the theme under discussion—"The Immortality of the Wicked. Our first remark is, that the *onus probandi* in the discussion of this question rests upon those who assert their destruction, who are denominated "destructionists," or perhaps more properly *annihilationists.*

It is refreshing to hear one expression that has tangibility to it—"The Immortality of the Wicked." That looks like coming to the point. But our friend says, "The *onus probandi* in the discussion of this question rests upon those who assert their destruction!" We dissent from this conclusion. C. maintains the wicked are immortal, if there is any meaning to his remarks. He then has the *affirmative*, and is bound to establish it from revelation or his position falls to the ground; and he proceeds in his herculean task as follows:

Our next remark is that the immortality of the soul is *eminently* a doctrine of Revelation; not, however, that any of the inspired writers offer a single argument to prove the doctrine. They all, with one consent, *assume* its truth as they do the being of God and the eternity of future rewards and punishments, and hence proceed to build the system of faith and practice upon the basis of those and other doctrines. It is in this sense alone, as we conceive, that the immortality of the soul is a doctrine of Revelation. Hence the appeal for its truth to the Divine teaching must be made with the understanding of its assumption by the inspired writers, as setting their seal to sound metaphysical deduction. And before their testimony can be made to sustain the contrary doctrine, it must be shown from their teachings, under the due application of the essential canons of interpretation contrary to this assumption.

As we expected. Not a solitary text can be produced, from Revelation, either that man has a superadded entity called *the soul*, or of its *immortality*, No—"The inspired writers all with one consent *assume* its truth as they do the being of a God," &c., Now, if we were not an "*infidel*," we should be shocked at this double blasphemy. How many such statements would it take to convert a sinner from the error of his ways, that "a soul" might be saved "from death?" "*The soul* that sinneth *it* shall die," saith Jehovah. "No," saith modern divinity, "*it* can't die!" It is true the "inspired writers offer" not "a single a gument to prove the immortality of the soul," but "they all with one consent *assume*" it! Thus Ezekiel was not *inspired*, though he declares "The word of the LORD came unto me saying" * * * "*the soul* that sinneth *it shall die*!" Ezk. 18: 4, 20. And when Ezekiel uttered this language he only "*assumed* the being of a God!" But, unfortunately for our friend C., Ezekiel did *not* "*assume* the soul is immortal," but gave utterance to the truth, from the mouth of JEHOVAH, that "the soul"—whatever it is—"under given contingences," *viz*, if it "*sinneth it shall die.*"

The idea that "the being of God" is *assumed*, by the inspired writers, without "a single argument to prove the doctrine" would answer well in the mouth of an *Atheist;* but for a professed Minister of the Gospel to utter such a sentiment is truly lamentable. Nothing is more clearly set forth, and that in the most explicit declarations. "*I am God*, and there is none else." "Hear, O Israel, the LORD your God is one LORD." "Say unto them as I *live* saith the LORD God." "To us there is *one God*, the Father," with a multitude of similar texts. God explicitly revealed his being and attributes, and proclaimed them in language not to be misunderstood; yet Mr. C. tells us, all the inspired writers *assumed* the being of God, and in the same way they *assumed* the immortality of the soul! Here then is a theologian who stakes the being of God on the truth of an immortal soul in man: the one stands on the same evidence, or by the same argument, as the other; or rather upon *no* "*argument*" at all! It is all *assumed.* If one doctrine falls the other falls! If the soul is not immortal, *there is no God!* And has it come to this? Is this fancy soul to be thrown in the

balance to decide the existence of Jehovah? So it seems; but before we have done with this latest Goliah we shall try a few smooth stones from the brook of truth. Our friend C. will understand that we do not take *assumptions* as any weight, or of any force; he cannot be permitted to cast such dust in our eyes. We affirm, in opposition to him, there is not one of the "inspired writers" that ever "*assumes* the immortality of the soul": it is a pure *fiction* to assert they do; and to insinuate, such doctrine stands on the same basis as the "being of God" is to "handle the word of the Lord deceitfully." Whether the deception is *intended* or not we judge not; but that it is a deception we have no doubt; and it forcibly brings to mind the apostle's saying, that "in the last days" certain men would be "*deceiving and being deceived.*" What greater deception than, after having admitted that not "any of the inspired writers offer a single argument to prove the" immortality of the soul, to assert that they *assumed* it? and that "the being of God" stands upon the same ground! So far from any inspired writer ever *assuming* the immortality of the soul, they speak expressly of the *death* of the soul: not indeed of that "immaterial" *nothing* which theologians call the soul; for no inspired writer ever heard of *such a soul;* or, if they had, they considered it quite too fanciful ever to mention it. Mr. C. next says:—

If we understand the advocates of annihilation, their doctrine includes these two essential points, that the soul was created neither immaterial nor immortal, but that immortality will be conferred as a reward upon the righteous. This is one main point. The other is, that, as a punishment upon the wicked they will be left, after suffering conscious retributive punishment for a limited period, to fall back into their original nonentity. This being their doctrine, the chief scriptural argument on which they rely for its demonstration, if we comprehend them, is this: They take those declarations of the inspired writers, in which they use the term "destruction," as meaning that the soul will be utterly *destroyed.* Whereas, were no favorite system of doctrine in question to be sustained by giving the term destruction this application, it would be easy to convince the intelligent and reasonable student of the Scriptures that the *analogy of faith*, to say nothing of the immateriality and consequent essential immortality of the soul, would require that this term, when applied to the future state of the wicked, must be taken in a qualified and restricted or figurative sense. The figure of speech employed in such cases, as when the sacred writers speak of the wicked being "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power," is what is called *hyperbole.* This figure either "magnifies or diminishes objects or things beyond or below their proper limits." Hence it is obvious that to represent that which is indestructible as being destroyed, must be a hyperbolical expression in which the soul is reduced *below* its proper limits, than which nothing need be plainer.

If Mr. C. "understands" us, he would understand that we demonstrate that "the living *soul*" was "formed of the dust of the ground"; made *alive* by "the breath of life," which gave life to all other "living souls" that swim in the sea, fly in the air, or creep upon the ground. See Gen. 1: 20, 21, 24, 30; 2: 7, 19; 7: 22, 23, and examine the margin and the original text. Here is demonstration that all C.'s talk about the "immateriality and immortality of the soul" is "*assumed,*" and that too in the plainest contradiction of the Mosaic account of creation. Man's creation was an *organism*, such as God was pleased to make; not immaterial; but *material*, *tangible*, *alive.* Man's "punishment" for sin, or "the wages of sin, is death." Gen. 2: 17; 3: 19; Ezk. 18; 4, 20; Rom. 6: 21—23. This *death* is neither a "*hyperbole*" nor a "*figure*": it is an awful *reality;* a dissolution of man's organism—a deprivation of life; and when final it is *eternal*; and hence is his "eternal punishment;" not eternal sin and suffering, but an eternal cessation of life. We are not of the number "to represent that which is indestructible, as being destroyed;" but we deny that any soul of man, by his creation or generation, is "indestructible;" and friend C. has produced nothing but *assumptions* to the contrary; of that fact, "nothing need be plainer." Again he says:

The following rule is also violated in giving those passages which speak of the destruction of the wicked a literal interpretation, which is this: "The literal meaning of words is to be given up if the predicate, being literally taken, is contrary to the subject." The soul is the subject, destruction the predicate But the soul is indestructible. Hence destruction, the predicate, taken literally, is contrary to the nature of the soul, the subject of the proposition. Therefore destruction is only used to describe the awfulness of future punishment; and when it is construed into literal annihilation, it is in the most palpable violation of this canon of Scripture intepretation.

C.'s predilections for *assumption* are apparent. There is no argument in this paragraph unless he can *prove* "the soul is indestructible;" which he has not yet begun to do. As he builds on sand his house falls. He might as well say, God is not omnipotent as to say "the soul is indestructible": the one sentiment is just as true as the other. Hear C. again:

The following canon is also trampled in the dust by this *constructive* application of "destruction." "Where the literal meaning of words is contrary, either to common sense, the context, to parallel passages, or to the scope of the passage, it must be given up." Want of space precludes the citation of examples in illustration of this rule. But still another canon is violated by the literal application of the term destruction to the wicked. It is this: "The literal meaning of words is to be given up, if it be either improper, or involve an impossibility." Hence this rule rescues all those passages in question from the forced service which destructionists compel them to yield in favor of annihilation: as the tyrant master compels the imbruted slave to do deeds in violation of all virtue and conscience.

We do not object to either of the "*canons*" our friend has here introduced; but it is a mere *assumption* that they apply as he supposes. The *literal* destruction of the wicked is neither opposed "to common sense" nor "an impossibility." But it is opposed "to common sense," and "an impossibility," that an "immaterial, immortal, and indestructible" being can *suffer* in any way, or by any means, "Hence" such beings need not fear the *theological* hell; for if it were "seven times" hotter than Nebuchadnezzar's furnace, it could not hurt a hair of their head, nor make the least impression on them in ten thousand millions of ages.

But friend C. warms up as he proceeds; and makes up for his barreness in argument by strong assumptions. See the following:

But this forced and constructive interpretation is fatal to the *analogy of faith*. This has been explained to be "the constant and perpetual harmony of Scripture in the fundamental points of faith and practice." Several canons grow out of this definition—all which are violated by the interpretation in question. We can mention only the following:—"Wherever any doctrine is manifest, either from the whole tenor of Divine revelation or from its scope, it must not be weakened or set aside by a few obscure passages." See Horne's Introduc., Part II., &c. Now what "doctrine is manifest from the whole tenor and scope" of Revelation, if it is not that of the immortality of the soul? The eternity of the Supreme Being himself is scarcely more so. Nor would greater violation be done to the above canons, and the others which are essential to the sober and consistent interpretation of the Scripture, in deducing from them so abhorrent a doctrine as would be the destruction of the Divine Nature! This, it is true, could only be done by a forced construction of a few passages in the face of all the rest—the very process by which the destruction of the soul is deduced from Revelation by Annihilationists.

"The constant and perpetual" testimony of "Scripture" is that "the LORD God formed *man* of the dust of the ground": Gen. 2: 7—that his "foundation is in the dust": Job. 4: 19—that he is "*mortal*:" Job. 4: 17—that he is "*corruptible*," as the "birds, and four-footed beasts: Rom. 1: 23—that "the wicked shall perish forever *like his own dung*:" Job. 20: 7—that "he shall not be:" Psa. 37: 10—that "the wicked—the enemies of the LORD shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away": Psa. 37: 20—"they shall be as nothing; thou shalt seek them and shalt not find them": Isa. 41: 11, 12—"and they shall be as though they had not been": Obadiah 16. But we need not multiply texts; for our friend C. will find that when he once gets out of the fog of sectarianism the "*analogy of faith*" is entirely on our side of the question.

We accept, and do it gladly, the "canon" C. has introduced from Horne's Introduc., Part II. C. then asks "what doctrine is manifest from the whole tenor and scope of Revelation, if it is not the immortality of the soul?" He adds—"The eternity of the Supreme Being himself is scarcely more so."

Really, friend C. must be sincere and in earnest in the support of his theory to stake the eternity of God on the immortality of the soul: but we must tell him, in all candor, his sincerity and earnestness stamp his effort with the character of *monomania*. Without one solitary testimony in the Bible that the soul is immortal, and on a bare *assumption*, he stakes "the eternity of the Supreme Being" on the truth of his assumption! "Thus saith the high and holy One that inhabiteth *eternity*, whose name is lofty," &c. Isa. 57: 15; "But the LORD is the true God, he is the living God, and *King of Eternity*": Jer. 10: 10, text and margin. Now tell us where is the text that saith "*the soul is immortal*"? It is *nowhere* to be found in the English translation, nor in the Greek, Hebrew, or Syriac Scriptures! Friend C. may yet come out an *atheist*: nay, we do not see but such a result is inevitable, if his *pet* immortal soul should prove to be a fancy, as we have no doubt it is.

As to the charge of our putting a forced construction" on "a few passages in the face of all the rest" to sustain the doctrine of the literal destruction of the wicked, we will say, it comes with a bad grace from one who has not one text asserting the immortality of the soul, and who has to *assume* it, and contend the "inspired writers assumed it." C. proceeds to say:

The apostle, it is true, says of God, "Who only hath immortality." But his meaning obviously

is, that God alone has *underived* immortality. Because to take this passage literally, would be to negative the immortality of angels, good as well as bad, along with that of all good as well as bad men. And when the same apostle declares that God will "render eternal life" to them who "seek for glory, honor, and immortality," we are manifestly to understand a *blessed* immortality, in order to perfect the antithesis to that "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish" which will as certainly be "rendered" to the "contentious who do not obey the truth." This is what the above canons require in the exposition of these passages, and what destructionism in its glaring violation of them repudiate.

The first member of the foregoing paragraph we do not object to. God alone hath immortality independent of all other beings, is doubtless the apostle's meaning; but to the second member of this paragraph we do object. There is no authority for adding "*blessed*" to immortality. The Bible knows of no other immortality than that of a *blessed* one, and it never speaks of any other; and no other is possible in the very nature of the case. The very idea of immortality excludes all suffering: suffering is the sure and certain indication of mortality. "Tribulation and anguish" is evidence of exclusion from immortality, and indicative of a state of dissolution. No problem is plainer than this to our mind; and the apostle marks the fact that "*death*" is the result of the "tribulation and anguish" inflicted upon those "who do not obey the truth": comp. Rom. 1: 32; 2: 12; 6: 21, 23. Again C. says:

But if the soul is immaterial, consequently immortal and imperishable, its moral character with which it goes into eternity, can have no possible effect upon any of its natural attributes. Of these, immateriality is one; immortality another; and intelligence and consciousness another. Hence, with as good reason may we conclude that the souls of the wicked will be divested of their consciousness in a future state as their immortality. This once lost, there would be of course at that moment an end of their misery. And would not the same consequence follow from their annihilation? For with the soul all its attributes and faculties must perish.

Our friend's conclusions here turn on the truth of his "if; if" and "if"; and as he has given nothing but *assumptions* for his "if" we let this paragraph pass for its value. Next our friend C. jumps at conclusions as follows:

But the final doom of the wicked is, to be with the "devil and his angels." The terms of duration of the punishment of both will be the same, i. e. "eternal," or "forever and ever" They will be associated together while it continues. But on the annihilation hypothesis, at some point in eternity more or less remote, devils will lose their late partners in woe; their companions in "anguish" and "wrath" will find a refuge from the fiery storm which had beat upon them, in the utter extinction of their being! On this bold and baseless hypothesis *despair* can never be an ingredient in this cup of trembling. Because, however distant from the commencement of their limited, so called, retributive punishment, their annihilation may be, it is certain, at length to arrive. But on the contrary, just as soon will holy angels, after listening for uncounted ages to the songs of the redeemed, see them in a moment drop their golden harps, and whole choirs, and adoring circles vanish into nought, while the last note of their chorus dies away and ceases to reverbrate in the lofty dome of heaven's high temple, as the songsters perish from their vacant seats. This we say would be no more in violation of the whole tenor and scope of Scripture teaching, because the destruction of the immortal, that is the deathless soul. whether of the wicked or holy, is alike impossible —except by an uncreating act as omnifinic as that which originally gave the soul its being. For God made the soul in the image of his own eternity; hence, no hand but his own can mar or efface that image.

"The term and duration of the punishment" of the devil and his angels, and wicked men will be "eternal" or "forever and ever"; that we have never questioned. But what is that *punishment*? C. and his school say it is to be in a state of endless sin and suffering: we affirm its *death—deprivation of life*, and that "forever and ever." "The Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil:" 1 John 3: 8; and friend C. will not question that "He that committeth *sin* is of the devil," and doeth "the works of the devil." Now if the devil and his *sin workers* are to carry on their trade of *sinning eternally*, the Son of God has failed in his mission and the devil is victorious. But thanks be to God, "the inspired writers" neither "assume," nor leave it for us to *assume*, that Christ will "destroy *him* who had the power of death, that is, *the devil*," Heb. 2: 14; and with him all his brood; for "*all the wicked* will God destroy": Psa. 145: 20. "And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne; and unto the Lamb forever and ever": Rev. 5: 13.

Here "an inspired writer" has placed before our mind the glorious fact that a period will arrive when every intelligent, conscious being, in all the creation of God, and in every possible location, will praise God, and the Lamb. At that time the devil and his children will either have been con-

verted or annihilated. Be it which it may, they no longer exist as wicked suffering beings; and our friend's "bold and baseless hypothesis," of immortality in sin and suffering, is destroyed.

C.'s "bold and baseless" *assumption* that "God made the soul in the image of his own eternity," may pass, as the falsehood of it is too apparent to need or merit a reply. Our friend C. goes on in the following very cool strain:

The fact indisputably is, destructionism holds a sort of middle ground between eternal punishment and the fanciful speculation of final restoration of the wicked to future happiness. It seems to have been originally adopted by Christians to escape both extremes. It seems first to have obtained a little more than a century since in England, and to have been advocated by a few men who, in their day, attracted some passing attention. But in the Christian Church we find no traces of its existence at a higher date. Though, says Mr. Adams in his work entitled, "The Religious world Displayed," "This doctrine is of long standing in the world, and has been maintained by Pagans and Jews, as well as by Christians." It must however be regarded as one of those excrescent blemishes which have so strikingly marred the beauty of the fair face of sound Christianity. It is, however, only an excrescence which the judicious application of the caustic of sober and intelligent exegesis will suffice ultimately to remove. Or, like those disagreable and superfluous appendages which sometimes appear upon the surface, but which form no part of the vitality or perfection of the body, and which after a brief existence, at length disappear of their own accord. So it may with this empty speculation, which though for the time being fastened upon Christianity without constituting any part of the system, and having thus on the credit of that system, sustained its morbid existence during its day, will at length disappear and fall into merited oblivion, without leaving so much as a scar behind to attest its former being.

Very philosophical! Very conclusive! What an easy matter to dispose of this "*excrescent*" notion, that "all the wicked will God destroy"! "We find no traces of its existences at a higher date" than "a little more than a century since in England"! No, not "in the Christian Church!" True, "Mr. Adams says in his work entitled, 'The Religious World Displayed,' this doctrine is of long standing in the world, and has been maintained by Pagans and Jews, *as well as Christians*": but, "It must be regarded as one of those excrescent blemishes which have so strikingly marred the beauty of the fair face of sound Christianity"!

Thus talks our friend Comfort; and it is some *comfort* that he has produced no other weapons than *assumptions* and *assertions*, all of which will doubtless pass for proof with those who swallow whatever a divine puts into their mouth, forgetting that priest may be as ignorant as themselves.

The Jews held no other doctrine, till corrupted by their intercourse with the heathen, than that of the destruction, or annihilation of the wicked. Jesus Christ nor his apostles never taught any other doctrine; and they proclaimed a future life—a life from the dead—only through "Jesus and the resurrection"—which resurrection was *peculiar* to the Church of Christ, as members of his body; and to obtain which, Paul said he labored and suffered, "If," saith he, "*by any means* I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead," Phil. 3: 11.—"Chirst, who is *our life*," is appointed of God to give life to dying men; yet many "will not come to me that ye might have life," saith the Saviour. "He that believeth not God, hath made Him a liar, because he believeth not the *record* that God gave of His Son." But what is the *record*, which if a man believe not he makes God a *liar*? "*This is the record*, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life* is in His Son: he that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life"; 1 John, 5: 10–12. Such is *God's* testimony; but the whole race of *assumers* give God *the lie;* and affirm that man has an endless life *in himself*, independent of, and without any regard to a union with the Son of God! These are the men to talk about the doctrine of life eternal and immortality only in and through Christ being an "*excrescence*"!—No, it is their own theory that is the *excrescence*, that has blackened and darkened the "fair face of sound Christianity," till they have driven their hearers, who never think, into a rejection of Christianity altogether, considering it much more honorable to God to reject the Bible than to credit such blasphemy against Him and His attributes as that which the advocates of endless sin and suffering attribute to Him. Mr. Comfort, in his work against Universalism, page 91, says—"If *eternal life* was procured for the world by the mission of Christ, it follows that *to perish* is to suffer *eternal death*,—or, the soul being deathless,—*eternal* misery." Here he spoke truth till he "changed the truth of God into a lie" by *assuming* the soul to be "*deathless*." Thus it is that the immortal soul advocates corrupt the word of God. See Rom. 1: 23, 25.

When we say the advocates of inherent immortality "give God *the lie*," we do not wish to be understood as saying they do so knowingly. We

presume most of them would no more do this than ourself: but that does not alter the fact in itself; God *is* charged with falsehood by the *assumption;* and His "*record*" made to be false; for if men have endless life *in themselves* then it is not "*in* His Son," as God declares it to be. We know well the advocates of natural immortality undertake to say, "eternal life," in the text, "does not mean eternal *existence* but eternal *happiness;*" and we know this is adding *sin to sin:* it is saying God did not utter in the *record* what he meant. May the Lord "forgive them; they know not what they do." Early education and sectarian trammels have blinded their minds. May the veil soon be removed from their hearts: then will they see that they have "robbed God." Mr. C. goes on as follows:

The destruction of the wicked is as gratuitous in sound philosophy as it is unsupported by fair and intelligent Scriptural interpretation. Philosophy asserts that under the laws which govern matter, not one particle can perish, except by an act of Omnipotence. All its known phenomena consists only in an endless succession of accretions, dissolutions, and recombinations. Hence, if the material world itself is ever destroyed, it must be by an act of the same Omnipotence which gave it being. That this event will transpire at some juncture indefinitely future, rests for its certainty upon inspired authority alone. How much more should the annihilation of the immortal spirit, which the floods cannot drown, which the conflagration of the universe cannot burn, nor the concussion of the mightiest orbs crush! The proof of both should therefore be alike *valid*, to make the two events alike inevitable. But the annihilation of the wicked can be proved only by a *constructive* application of a few passages of Scripture in the most glaring opposition to the scope and tenor of inspired teaching as to their future condition and final doom under retributive punishment.

C.'s "philosophy" may pass for its value. It amounts to just about this—"One particle of matter cannot perish—therefore a fish, a fowl, a horse, *a man* cannot perish"! "The material world," however, he admits will be "destroyed at some juncture indefinitely future"; but this fact "rests upon inspired authority alone." But the immortality or immateriality of the soul, friend C., "rests upon" *un*inspired "authority alone," and is purely an *assumption* without proof; and hence for C. to talk about the impossibility of "the annihilation of the immaterial spirit," is to talk in a dream, and out of his own heart. The "proof" is a thousand times more clear, from revelation, that the wicked shall be "utterly consumed," Psa. 73: 19; "shall be *utterly exterminated*." Acts 3: 23, (see Bloomfield's notes on this text;) "shall be no more," Psa. 104: 35, than it is that this material world will ever be destroyed. Yet C. can believe the latter while he rejects the former.

We come now to the conclusion of this essay on the immortality of the soul. It winds up thus:

There is another point towards which we would glance a thought or two in conclusion. A writer on the nature of the soul, in a late number of the Free Will Baptist Quarterly, maintaining its pure immateriality, says in effect, that as it has no dimensions, shape, or any of the properties of matter whatsoever, *it can have no locality*. This we strongly doubt. Such a consequence does not follow. For all finite spirits, angels as well as men, must either fill immensity and thus be omnipresent; or they must be limited to some portion of space, and thus be undeniably local. This, however, is only saying that they must be either finite or infinite—between which there is a boundless disparity. Hence, no finite spirit can occupy more than one point in space, any more than one moment in duration at the same time, because they are neither omnipotent nor eternal. All finite subsistences, as we conceived, must at a given time be limited to a given locality somewhere in immensity, or in that same given time be in the act of transition between one point and another in immensity. Angels are not present in heaven and on earth at the same time—pure spirits though they are. So must it be with human spirits. Time and space are terms which have no legitimate application to the Infinite and the Eternal. But all finite beings, from their limited natures, whether material or spiritual, of necessity hold inseparable relations to both.

As this last paragraph relates only to differences among the advocates of natural immortality we may pass it with a single remark, *viz.:* that the Free Will Baptist gives a pretty fair account of this fancy soul—"It has no dimensions, shape, or any of the properties of matter," hence, "*it can have no locality.*" That is a fair statement of these fancy souls—they are *nothing*, and dwell *nowhere!* Just about the truth, and we do not see why C. need "doubt" it.

We have thus given C. a fair hearing, as we have given every word of his long essay. Our readers can judge as to the force there is in such *assumptions* and *assertions*. We record it as a *curiosity* in the immortality controversy.

THE OFFICE OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER is, at our *Residence, No. 62 Hicks Street,* Brooklyn; a short distance from *Fulton Ferry*: but let none forget that our *address* is, "GEO. STORRS, *Editor Bible Examiner, New York.*"

Usually we can be found at home at all hours except between nine and eleven o'clock in the morning, when we visit *New York* and call at DR. MCALLISTER'S 141 Fulton St., where orders may be left for us by persons calling in the city, and not wishing to go to our residence.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, MARCH 15, 1856.

Man's Origin and Nature.

THE notion that man, by creation, is possessed of an immortal entity, called *soul*; and that he was created *holy*, originally, we think, is the foundation of nearly all the theological errors and superstitions that have bewildered, blinded, and made infidels of a large part of Christendom, or those where this corrupt theology has been promulgated.

The account of man's creation, as given by Moses, is very simple and easy of comprehension; and when duly considered commends itself as the only rational account of man's origin and nature: especially when we gaze on the facts in man's death, or *disorganization.*

Man's *origin* is the same as that of any other of the *animal* creation. Compare Gen. 2: 7 and 19. "The LORD God *formed man* of the *dust of the ground.*" * * * "And out of *the ground* the LORD God *formed every beast* of the field, and every *fowl* of the air."

Thus it appears the *origin* of man is precisely the same as that of other living creatures on the earth. The only real difference is this—Man's *organization* made him capable of a higher *intellectual* developement than any other of the animal creation; and for this reason, he was placed at the head of all the others, and to have "*dominion over*" them.

As to *holiness*, there is no evidence in the Mosaic account that man was in possession of any such quality more than other animals. "God saw *every thing* that he had made, and behold it was *very good*": Gen. 1: 31. All were alike *good*, but not a word of the holiness of any of them. Holiness is not a *creation*—it cannot be created—but it is a *development.* As such it can only be produced in a created being by *trial.* In order to its developement there must be *law* to which the creature is required to yield obedience; and there must be *intelligence* sufficient to comprehend that law, without which no law can have any claim to *active* obedience. Where such intellectual capacity does not exist—whatever the nature of the life in possession—there can be no claim for moral obedience, and hence neither holiness nor sin has any existence in that being—the thing is impossible.

Man, of all the animal creation, alone—so far as we know—had intellectual capacity sufficient to understand law—requirement or prohibition—addressed to mind; or a capacity to determine from words addressed to his understanding what his course of conduct should be. This capacity was the basis, or foundation, for the developement of a moral character above that of a mere animal. But such development could not be made without a law addressed to man's intellect; and that law must be adapted to his understanding or comprehension. As yet he is but an *animal* and can only be approached *as* an animal man. Hence the law must relate to the action of his animal nature. In harmony with this fact we find his CREATOR thus approaching him, having provided for the new formed creature "every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food," He placed man in the midst of these delights and bid him regale himself without restriction with one exception. That one exception constituted *the law*—a law the highest of which man's nature was then capable, and yet the most trifling that it was possible to give. This law was addressed to man's intelligence, and related to the regulation of his animal appetites; or was addressed to him as an animal, such as he really was.

Hence he was tested, or tried as an *animal* for the development of a moral character; which trial if man obeyed his CREATOR would have raised him above a mere animal—or above the government of animal appetites—and would have constituted him *holy.* It would have developed a mind having a supreme regard to his MAKER'S *will. This* is *holiness.* Such a development would have—if persevered in—proved him worthy of continued *life;* hence would have secured him access to the "*tree of life,*" and he would have "*lived forever.*"

But a contrary development would unfit him for life, by making him out of harmony with the CREATOR, preferring his *own will* to that of God's; hence the propriety of its being distinctly stated to the man, that if he did show himself determined to make his own will supreme he should "*surely die*": discord under the government of God could not be tolerated. Every thing that has life must come into harmony with God or discord be eternal. Hence when Adam developed the fact that he chose to give the supremacy to himself, or to his animal being, rather than to his CREATOR, he, in fact, chose *death* rather than renounce animal gratification. Thus, Adam had "*Life and Death* set before" him. He chose the latter—fell under his animal nature, and shared the fate of all other animals, but death was just as much more to be dreaded by him as his intellect was greater than

theirs. Not, however, because he had any *sufferings* to endure "beyond the grave," for his CREATOR made no such communication to him: it was, "*Dust* THOU art, and unto *dust* shalt THOU return." So far as we have any inspired authority, such was the end of the *animal Adam*. In unbroken and eternal death and silence he is to remain.

In the whole account man is spoken of, treated as, and his destiny decided, as a unit: not as part *mortal* and part *immortal*. Such a position is a pure, unfounded, unscriptural, and mischievous *assumption*; and has filled Christendom with superstition, notions about purgatory, ghost worshipers, worshiping the dead, spirit-rappers, doctrines of demons, and infidelity; all the natural result and offspring of corrupting the word of God in relation to man's origin, nature, and destiny.

Adam's posterity are on trial as animal beings, like as he was. They are indeed, under another and different dispensation. His failure was final by *one* transgression, and the penalty *certain* to follow; admitting of the remission: His posterity have been subjected to death "in hope." That is—though they die their death may be abrogated, or abolished, by a *union* with the second Adam, Jesus the Messiah. The animal nature must be subjected, or brought under "subjection" to an intellect purified by the Spirit and word, or *will* of God. The dispensation we are under admits of repentance towards God, for past failures, and remission of sins past, through union with the second Adam—the *Life Giver*—so that death may be abrogated, or annulled. By this union with the second Adam, the Spirit of God is received, the intellect, or mind, becomes in harmony with God, and is subjected to His will, denying the animal nature, keeping it under and bringing it into subjection to the will, or word of God. See Rom. 8: 9–15; 1 Cor. 9: 26, 27. Thus living—thus dying—death cannot hold them; it cannot prevail to keep them under its power; they are *members* of the second Adam, and must share in his revival into life, clothed with incorruptibilty and immortality.

It will be seen that men are still dealt with as units, and as animal beings; naturally subject to mortality, corruption, and death; and that in order to escape these, the animal, or flesh, is to be mortified—made to keep its place, as a servant—while the will of God is to be supreme, and the animal be made to give way wherever it acts up a plea opposed to the will of God, as revealed in His word of truth. Those who thus act, during their probationary state, continue to be temples of the Holy Spirit, which dwelleth in them, and whereby they are sealed unto the day of redemption. See 1 Cor. 6: 19; 2 Tim. 1.: 14; Eph. 4: 30. "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. 8: 11.

The great work of redemption is to redeem, or deliver, men from sin—the dominion of the flesh, or animal nature—and from corruption or death. To puzzle men with metaphysical and theological notions about immaterialism—immortal souls—undying souls—half alive and half dead—part in the grave and a part in heaven, or hell, or purgatory, and all such anti-scriptural fancies, is to shut up the kingdom of heaven against men," by bewildering their minds, and making the impression that religion is all fancy, about which the priest alone has any concern; and in the final result to land men in utter indifference to all religion. Shall men continue to be thus deceived by traditions?

Death not a Translation.

"Thou art not dead, my Rosa, though no more
Inhabitant of this tempestuous shore."
[Bland's *Greek Anthology*.

In reply to the address presented to Mrs. STOWE at Leeds, England, this amiable and distinguished lady, among other things, said,—

"I have visited, in my pilgrimage, the home of Clarkson. I passed a night in the chamber that for years was consecrated by his prayers, and from which he ascended to heaven."

On reading these words, the question involuntarily came into our mind, was the benevolent and heroic Clarkson translated, like Enoch, so that he did not taste of death? That this was possible, no one who believes in the Divine power will deny. But, then, the whole of the facts run the other way, and the good lady has simply misinterpreted them, and the plainest teaching of the Word of Truth. Clarkson was not exempted from the ordinary lot of men; many carried him to the grave and made great lamentation: had he been translated actually, no such service would have been required, no such feelings would have been expressed. We may say of him what the apostle Peter uttered about the Psalmist, who fell beneath the stroke of death—"After he had served his generation, by the will of God he fell *asleep*, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption,"—"he is *not ascended into the heavens*,"—"he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day!" The speaker of these sentences had no such faith as that expressed by Mrs. Stowe,—his language is explicit on the point he handles, and is perfectly opposed to the sentiment she utters. Clarkson died, not apparently, but really:

Clarkson was carried to the tomb, and the man Clarkson sleeps there, in hope of a resurrection to immortality. Very likely he had the hope concerning himself that the reply of Mrs. Stowe expressed concerning him, but, like many other hopes, it was doomed to destruction; believing we shall survive death will not create the fact. She spoke nothing peculiar to herself, in regard to his destiny, but the anti-scriptural opinions concerning the state of the godly, posterior to what is most improperly denominated death. Her words sound fine,—they rise into the sublime; their great defect is they are *not* true. Were they true, to hold that Clarkson died—lost his life, would be exceedingly absurd. *Dead and alive*—life lost and yet retained,—activity destroyed, and activity intensified,—sleep inflicted, and the highest wakefulness preserved,—the man in corruption, and corruption an impossibility,—the silence of death, and the songs of heaven! No, no, error is fortunately encompassed with glaring contradictions; but the truth stands forth in simple power, though sometimes in majestic sadness. There is an eternal and most intelligible distinction between death and translation; between tasting death and escaping the draught. There were no groans, no sighs, no prostration, no speechlessness, no corruption, no burial, in Enoch's case; he rose on the wings of power, and passed to the angelic shores,—leaving death and the grave behind him. There was a chamber, a garden, or a field, whence he was sweetly elevated to the bosom of his God; and whoever saw him ascend would gaze up after him with excess of astonishment, and instead of wailing over his triumph and honor, would go home to recite them with feelings of rapture. Death is another scene, and awakens other emotions. It requires no painting,—for who has not seen it? The emotions need not be described,—for who has not felt them? We may, in the language of orthodoxy, be told, that the friend who has just expired has "ascended to heaven"; nature, however, as it were, battles with the delusion, and the mournful silence of the widow, and the tears of sisters and brothers, tell that the dogma has the marks of suspicion stamped on its forehead. Better believe with Peter, than with those who are, unconsciously to some extent, heathenized in their theology; better, oh! ten thousand times rather learn of Jesus, who said, "I am the resurrection and the life," than of the most eloquent pen that ever was moved.

The writer of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is, in her theology, exceedingly orthodox, and, we regret to add, on some points, as on the one we have adverted to, exceedingly unscriptural. So we think, and so we affirm. The very popularity of a work, in which there is so much religion, would, in a time like this, excite our suspicion; and our expectations, on reading it, were more than fulfilled. Had the *religion* been more scriptural, it never would have had the fame it has got. We admire her genius and her sterling efforts to enforce the benevolence of Christianity, and the claims of the Negro on the justice and sympathy of mankind; but when she delivers what is opposed to the teaching of the Bible concerning man, his position and destiny, or any kindred point, we deem it proper to expose her errors for the benefit of the world.

M.

DR. PYE SMITH

And the Separate State of the Soul.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM, ENGLAND.

The biography of a great and good man is at all times a seasonable contribution to our literature, in which, when executed, with discrimination and rigid impartiality, it is allowed, by common consent to take a prominent place. It is not often that he whose personal intimacy, and literary qualifications, best entitle him to fulfil the duties of a biographer, can hold so entirely in obeyance his own partialities as to present a bona fide portraiture of his subject; what is least acceptable to him in the characteristics, tendencies, and experience of his friend, he will be tempted altogether to omit, or at least to present in so subdued a light as to scarcely arrest the attention of the reader. More particularly is this the case in a theological biography, such as that necessarily must be, which would familiarize us with the late Dr. Pye Smith, who, for so many years, fulfilled the important duties of a theological Professor in the Old College, at Homerton, and with a distinction which gave him a first place not only among Congregational Dissenters, to whose communion he belonged, but also among theological literati of every denomination, and of every country. A brief biographical notice of this eminent man, appears in the current number of the British Quarterly Review, suggested by the biography recently published by Mr. John Medway,* one of Dr. Smith's students, to whom the family of the deceased Doctor intrusted the delicate and difficult task which he has essayed to execute. The British Quarterly Reviewer indulges in reminiscences of his own; and from his contribution to the biography of the late Tutor of Homerton College, we shall extract a paragraph or two which will be interesting to most of our readers. In the following remarks of the Reviewer, we have an example of that rare quality in biographers to which we have adverted. Dr. Pye Smith, like all great thinkers, deviated in some particulars from the ordinary pathway of thought and conviction, and unlike many he possessed the candor to acknowledge his deviations. Even when they merely took the negative form of doubts, if those doubts were deeply established in his mind, and just in proportion to the importance of their subject, he would confess them, believing that truth was a gainer by the acknowledgment of his doubts, as well as by the declaration of his convictions. From what follows our readers will learn that Dr. Pye Smith could not subscribe, ex animo the popular faith of the *separate State of the Soul, and* a *State of Consciousness* between the time of Death and Resurrection.

* Memoirs of the Life and Writings of John Pye Smith, D. D., L. L. D., F. R. S., F. G. S., late Theological Tutor of the Old College, Homerton.

"Speaking of Dr. Smith's metaphysical tendencies, we approach a subject of some difficulty. We refer to the painful and harrassing doubts which he suffered in relation to the separate state of the soul in conscious existence between death and the resurrection of the body. How much distress he brought upon himself, and how much anxiety upon the supporters of the College, is known only to the few surviving friends who were then intimately associated with him. It was in itself the severest mental conflict he ever experienced, and in its results threatened to be the most disastrous. In a letter to his intimate friend, Mr. Alers Hankey, he says, 'I have had some similar seasons of distress on the great points of Christian doctrine, but never so long continued nor so equally balanced as in the present instance.' His conduct at that time shows not only the candor and integrity of his disposition, but the awful doubt and perplexity in which he was involved. In the course of his regular Sabbath morning exposition, he came to the 5th chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which thus commences,—'For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.' To omit this paragraph from his Sabbath exposition was an evasion which his honorable mind would not allow him to practice. It should be observed, that whatever were the difficulties with which he was embarrassed, these verses are favorable to the popular belief. In any arrangement of texts distributed into two columns, one for, and the other against the received doctrine, this text would occupy a chief place in the former column. Had he felt that there was a considerable preponderance of evidence in favor of his early faith, his proper course would have been to have stated the argument supplied by the figurative language of this passage in favor of the separate state: and the utmost which even his scrupulous candor could have required, was to have said that there were some difficulties which he could not reconcile with the natural interpretation of these verses. But evidently his doubts were too serious to allow him to adopt the more obvious interpretation of the text. He knew how to deal with objections when he was satisfied with the truth; but here he could not ascertain the truth, and therefore he would not preach upon the subject. Under the circumstances he saw but one course; and though he knew it might endanger his influence, his usefulness, and his position as a pastor and tutor, he candidly stated in the pulpit the extreme difficulty with which he was embarrassed."—pp. 198, 199.

From this extract we gather the following facts. That Dr. Pye Smith entertained very decided doubts in relation to the commonly received doctrine of the separate state of the soul, and a state of consciousness during the season of death,—that these doubts occasioned him very deep distress, and excited considerable anxiety in the supporters of the College. That during the time he was the subject of these doubts, he was engaged in expounding to the congregation of which he was pastor, the 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians, and that with the candor for which he was distinguished, he confessed the difficulty he experienced in expounding the opening verses of the 5th chapter of that Epistle, and in consequence, declined to preach on the subject. Such candor is the more exemplary, because, as the Reviewer says, "he knew it might endanger his influence, his usefulness, and his position as a pastor and tutor." On this we shall offer a remark or two as we proceed, but in the first place we have a word to say in reply to the conjectures of the Reviewer, who tells us, that

"For some years afterwards his reception of the doctrine of the separate state, was an act of faith to which his reasoning, after many a hard struggle, had been reduced to meek subordination: His faith was the purer and stronger for the conflict."—p. 199.

We have said that these statements are "conjectures," and we say on the authority of the Reviewer himself, who writes, "we cannot adduce positive evidence of these views." Let it then be understood that this last paragraph does not state a fact, but only a conjecture. Dr. Pye Smith appears to have confined his doubts to the secrecy of his own bosom during the latter years of his life, but because he said little or nothing on the subject, it does not surely follow, as the Reviewer, somewhat positively, as we think, after his own admission, tells us that "for many years afterwards, his (Dr. Smith's) reception of the doctrine of the separate state was *an act of faith.*" If, as the Reviewer says, he "cannot adduce positive evidence" of this change in the Doctor's mind, why does he write as if recording a historical fact in the doctor's theological experience? He tells us in the above quotation, with all the positiveness due to the record of an unquestionable fact, that Dr. Smith's "reasoning, after many a hard struggle, had been reduced to meek subordination," and that "his faith was the purer and stronger for the conflict." What we complain of here, is, the want of qualification after the acknowledgment that the writer "cannot adduce positive evidence" of what he nevertheless, so positively asserts. The following quotation from the Reviewer's own pen, seems to us to supply evidence, at least presumptive, if not positive, that the doubts of the Doctor gathered strength with his years, and settled down at last into actual conviction *against* the commonly received doctrine. The peculiar "distress" which these doubts at first occasioned him, gradually subsided, not, as the Reviewer conjectures, because his doubts gave place to "an act of faith," but because he had discovered in the sun-light of Scripture truth, that the denial of the immortality, and separate state of the soul, did not involve the denial of the Future Life, while the glorious doctrines of the Resurrection of the Dead was a chief topic of the Scripture revelation. This it was no doubt, that

> spoke his soul to rest,
> And bade the turmoil of his troubled breast
> Cease its sad strife.

The Reviewer apparently unconscious that he was drawing aside the veil, and discovering to his readers the actual consciousness of the Doctor's mind, informs us that

"Many of the students remember the fervor and animation with which he was accustomed to speak of the resurrection of the body, the development of the future glorious man from the grave, the indestructible atom sown in corruption, but raised in incorruption; sown in weakness, but raised in power; sown a natural body, but raised a spiritual body. Here his faith luxurated in the sunshine of his philosophy. No glorious combination or developement of matter was a mystery to him who saw the most beautiful flowers growing from insignificant seeds."—p. 199

Here is the true cause of that calm of mind which the Reviewer mistakenly supposes indicated a relapse to the old suspected faith. Dr. Pye Smith was not the man to halt in the pursuit of any important and legitimate inquiry from the fear of unsettling old convictions. As a true philosopher, he could not do such a violence to his intelligent nature, as the Reviewer strangely supposes, when he represents him as subjecting his "reasoning" to "meek subordination," where "reasoning," as, in this case, was the *only* means of arriving at *necessary* knowledge. The learned Doctor knew well that the Scriptures nowhere speaks of the immortality and separate state of the soul. In the article "*Adam*," which he contributed to Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, he translated the words "living soul" in Genesis, ii, 7, "living *animal*," and added, "some of our readers may be surprised at our having translated *nephesh hhaya* by *living animal*. There are good interpreters and preachers, who, confiding in the common translation, *living soul*, have maintained that there is insinuated the distinctive pre-eminence of man above the inferior animals, as possessed of *an immaterial and immortal spirit*. . . *We should be acting unfaithfully if we were to affirm its being contained or implied in this passage.*" The popular doctrine, he knew, had no formal foundation in the Bible, and therefore his philosophical mind sought information on a topic so interesting as the psychology of human nature in the realms of human science. Our own decided conviction is, that Dr. Smith was not so far in the rear of our modern philosophy as to doubt the propriety of regarding physiology as the true and only rational basis of a scientific psychology. We believe that his science, as careful as it was profound, first awoke his doubts relative to the doctrine of disembodied existence, and that gradually he gave up, without any mental reserve, a system of theological metaphysics, so obviously irrational as that which virtually denies the relation of function and organ in the human constitution, by asserting an unknown, unsubstantial something, called the immortal soul or spirit, as the ultimate organ of all the functions.

We can well conceive the deep anxiety and distress which such convictions would at first bring upon even such a man as Dr. Pye Smith, whose opinion, like that of other men, learned as well as unlearned, had been, that the denial of the immortality and separate state of the soul necessarily involved the denial of a Future Life. But when he discovered that this blessed hope depended on no psychological theory, but was solely contingent on the doctrine of a *resurrection*, his distress subsided, and was succeeded by enthusiastic delight. With the Psalmist he could say, "the entrance of *thy* word giveth light," as he dwelt with increasing satisfaction and joy on the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead—a doctrine which at once complemented and established the scientific correctness of his opinion, that the soul, or, more properly speaking, that *man* is not immortal by natural constitution, and that he is incapable of any disembodied and immaterial existence.

The remarks of the Reviewer on this passage in the mental and religious history of Dr. Pye Smith demand some notice. Referring to the embarrassment experienced by the Doctor in offering his exposition of the passage in the 5th chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he says, "It should be observed that whatever were the difficulties with which he was embarrassed, these verses are favorable to the popular belief. In any arrangement of texts, distributed into two columns, one for, and the other against the received doctrine, this text would occupy a chief place in the former column;" and he proceeds to suggest the course which the Doctor ought to have pursued under the circumstances. As this Reviewer merely asserts his opinions, we shall content ourselves, at present, with meeting him with a counter assertion. *We* do *not* think that the passage under notice is capable of being expounded on the commonly received opinions about the soul, and evidently Dr. Smith did not think so, and therefore he declined to preach on the subject. The Doctor, it can scarcely be doubted, pursued the right course under the circumstances, and said what it was necessary he should say. To *him* the common interpretation of this much disputed text was neither the "natural" nor the "obvious interpretation," and if *he* had drawn up, in columnar form, the texts pro and con, *he* would have placed this supposed stronghold of the popular doctrine in the column opposed to the commonly received opinions. So would Luther, Tyndale, Milton, Bishop Law, Archbishop Whately, and Professor Maurice, as well as not a few other earnest and intelligent Scripture students, both in Great Britain and America.

One word in conclusion, in reference to the consequences which the Reviewer says, threatened to follow the Doctor's departure from the professed faith, in this particular. Having alluded to the great "anxiety" which it occasioned "the supporters of the College," we presume, when he says that "in its results it threatened to be the most disastrous," he means "disastrous" to the Doctor's official relation to the college and his repute and usefulness in the denomination to which he belonged. That his change of opinion was not "disastrous" to his personal intelligence and piety is evidenced by the fact, by the aid of this new light he had discovered the real value and Scrip-

tural prominence of the doctrine of *resurrection*, whereon, in the decline of his years, he so fervently and thankfully reposed, as the true solace to one of strong faith in the promise of a future life, for which he had lived and labored, and of which he was soon about to fall asleep in hope. The Reviewer may possibly be of opinion that the Doctor's change of sentiment threatened "disastrous" consequence to his faith and piety,—not perceiving with the Doctor, the complemental value of the belief in the resurrection of the deceased humanity. However this may be, he refers particularly to the danger threatened to the Doctor's *official* position as a Pastor and Tutor, by the adoption of his new views. Would the Royal Society, or the Geological Society, of both which the Doctor was a highly esteemed Fellow, have considered his Fellowship jeopardized by the diligence of his researches, and the novelty of his communications? Would the students of any science, except theological science, frown upon the intelligent and independent exertions of one of their number, threaten him with official deposition, and deny him the rights of fraternity? Are we to understand that theological science is perfect,—that scientific theology is that abnormity, which, unlike any other science, is non-progressive? It is this monstrous folly on the part of religious bodies that so effectually and mischievously clogs the wheels of their progress, degrades them in the eyes of the intelligent, and denudes them of moral power in their influence on the masses. Intelligent independence, which takes the lead in all true progress, is strangled in the birth among the sects. Its presence is the signal first of general suspicion, and then of violent and unreasoning opposition. Its manly protest is met by revilings and reprobation, and its calm and dignified decision is recompensed with a writ of excommunication, not the less effectual because wanting a form. By this insane process of extradition, the timid and time-serving sects preserve their tame uniformity, with gradually diminishing numbers and influence, while a band of religious free-men receives constant accession, and perhaps, ere long will be sufficiently numerous to have a common unsectarian recognition. The outcasts of the sects will become the real religious operatives, and the openers of the door of salvation to an enslaved world. The sects are perpetrating the silliest suicide. Soon, if not already, shorn of their strength, they will stand before the world as the monuments of that folly which seeks the reformation and salvation of men by their trampling on their rational natures, and with blinded eyes leading them blindfold in search of the realms of light and life. "Can the blind lead the blind? shall they not both fall into the ditch?"

Scripture Expositions.

BY CATHARINE C. WILLIAMS.

Rom. 14: 10, 12. "For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ So then every one must give account of himself to God."

2 Cor. 5: 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in the body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

From these passages, and others of like import that might be named, two things seem certain, which the past history of the world, as well as individual experience, to some extent, has proved true; *viz:* that our good or bad course is *noted*—and in accordance with our course of conduct, will the result be. If we bear in mind that the wages of sin is death; and that death is the result of a life-consecration *of* our members as instruments *of* unrighteousness, we shall not be so much at a loss to decide upon the import of these and kindred declarations. We must be either good or bad—and in heart a lover *of* Truth and righteousness, or an enemy, however much we may dissemble: and it is not if we are bad *some*, or a little, we shall die a *little*, or a *great deal*, as the case may be; and if we are good *a little*, or otherwise, live accordingly; but to which course, independent of personal considerations, or advantages, are our affections given? sin or righteousness? Which are we trying by example and precept, to help along? If sin—and we do not confess, and forsake it—death is the end; which will be according to his deeds. If righteousness, and we cleave to it through life, "we have our fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life"; which will be according to such course.

True, there are various kinds of suffering attending a course of sin, differing as the course differs. Some ways tending to death swifter than others; but all sure—none miss their wages, which is neither more nor less than *death*. 'Tis not—how *much* bad have you done? but are you *bad?* If you are, you are not a lover *of* law and order; and will never make a good subject; and God can have "none that offend or do iniquity"—"no drunkard, or reviler, or extortioner, or *unclean*" person in his kingdom—only such as "are a law to themselves." The great Law Giver deems *death* a meet punishment for the *greatest*, as well as the *least* offence; as in both cases it deprives them of the power of harming either themselves or others more. What is suffered by the offender before receiving his wages depends on the *kind* of work done, and the way it is done.—But a little reflection will convince one, I think, that this has nothing to do with the wages; so that there seems to be no chance for *degrees* of punishment, as seems generally understood—this idea arising, I conceive, from not properly construing the passages under consideration.

The next thing to be considered is *the time when* our acts are to be re-viewed, judgment passed, and sentence executed thereon. Let us study ourselves—study the history of the past—look at children. Who has instituted the secret tribunal at which we feel ourselves arraigned on committing an unworthy act? Why did one misfortune, or judgment after another befall those in ancient times, accordingly as they departed from or kept the laws of God? And why all the calamities now in the world? What, but the result of a long train of causes, showing forth the righteous judgments of God, on nations as on indivi-

duals? Why do chil
they know is wrong,
answering these quest
what *time* "we must
seat of Christ" and "
God"? And is there
that every one must
and that our Maker i
and intents of the h
escapes his notice?
demned, or approved,
of having given an a
'Tis true, however,
sentence against an
speedily" (in many ins
of the children of m
evil"; but if any one
enings against evil d
and facts of their fulf
committed are of a p
can scarce fail to see
centrate: that it is
future, they should fe
the law—written in t
ten in our experienc
by nation, or individ
have a right to do as
to do right; for no
either himself or oth
sins in any way: the
in connection with
which disorder must,
disconnected with th
nection with the wro
not remedied by a t
will, and must eventu
will give account of
err in regard to ou
verdict in the case o
woman, will be so cle
I have no doubt, th
the confidence to say
Jesus receive my s
must feel, if sensible,
about to "receive ac

Shell-Rock, Iowa,

SPIRIT RAPPING.
to unseen spiritual
tention of a great n
within the last few
to attract some atte
It is pretended tha
sounds are made by
the living inhabitant
sence and their comm
among us who are
fact *go-betweens* to t
wish to witness the
spirits and gain inf
another world. The
the spirits, and indu
proposed by individu
ping or not rapping,
and by rapping whe
passing his finger o

duals? Why do children feel ashamed of what they know is wrong, and try to hide faults? In answering these questions, can we not decide at what *time* "we must stand before the judgment seat of Christ" and "give account of ourselves to God"? And is there danger of learning too soon that every one must give an account of himself, and that our Maker is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart?—that no secret thing escapes his notice? And when we feel self-condemned, or approved, what is this but the result of having given an account of ourselves to God?

'Tis true, however, in all time, that "because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily" (in many instances), "therefore the hearts of the children of men are fully set in them to do evil"; but if any one will carefully note the *threatenings* against evil doers, and the *nature* of them, and facts of their fulfilment, according as the evils committed are of a physical or moral nature, they can scarce fail to see where their fears should concentrate: that it is not an indefinite—far off—future, they should fear, but the curses written in the law—written in the history of the world—written in our experience. Never should it be said by nation, or individual, I am my own master, and have a right to do as I please, unless they please to do right; for no one has any right to injure either himself or others—which he must do if he sins in any way: therefore it must put everything in connection with the thing done in disorder, which disorder must, sooner or later, appear: not disconnected with the chain of events, but in connection with the wrong done: which disorders, if not remedied by a timely righting, and forsaking, will, and must eventuate in ruin. Thus every one will give account of himself to God, who cannot err in regard to our real character; and whose verdict in the case of every enlightened man, or woman, will be so clearly and definitely understood, I have no doubt, that no rejected one will have the confidence to say, in the day of death, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit"; but on the contrary, must feel, if sensible, *hope expire*, and that he is about to "receive according to his deeds."

Shell-Rock, Iowa, Jan. 16th, '56.

Spirit Rapping.—Rapping sounds, ascribed to unseen spiritual beings, have attracted the attention of a great number of persons in America within the last few years, and are now beginning to attract some attention here.

It is pretended that tapping, rapping or pecking sounds are made by departed spirits, who favor the living inhabitants of this world with their presence and their communications, to please certain among us who are styled *Mediums*, and are in fact *go-betweens* to the spirits and those of us who wish to witness the proofs of the presence of the spirits and gain information from these people of another world. The Medium causes the visit of the spirits, and induces them to answer questions proposed by individuals of the company, by rapping or not rapping, in order to signify yes or no; and by rapping when the inquiring individual, in passing his finger over the several letters of the alphabet, passes it over those which make up the word signifying the information, or over the numerals which represent the number of numerical matters about which an inquiry is made.

A philosopher would be justified in rejecting all this doctrine at once. We have no proof of the existence of any spirit* as distinct being in nature; they are merely imaginary beings,—"bottomless fancies,"—the offspring of by-gone times,—of ignorance, when men personified every power in nature, and fancied that power could exist alone, detached, inherent in nothing. We have no proof of the existence of any thing in nature but matter and its properties; and to regard the existence of power without matter, however fine and subtle, in which it is inherent, and of which it in truth forms a part, according to the actual compositions, &c., of the substance, is impossible to a strong, deep-thinking mind. We have no proof, or ground of belief, of anything else. These spirits, fancied, bottomless, unproved and unprovable, nay inconceivable, a philosopher is justified in at once rejecting as arrant nonsense. Of God, who must be supernatural and above all nature,—beyond nature, we can conceive and comprehend nothing, and therefore we exclude him from our consideration of his works. If the philosopher should be a Christian, he would be justified in rejecting this doctrine, because he not only sees clearly that we, bodies with properties as we are, perish into complete disintregration and dispersion, like all other organization, when we die, but looks forward on the promises of the New Testament, and on them only, to a future existence—to future life and immortality, as a miracle, as a gift, superadded to us, and revealed by the gospel; and believes that we shall exist again as bodies—rise with bodies—but not till the judgment day. Even if he believes in these inconceivable spirits, already existing before the last trump, he cannot believe that they can be called up from their abodes of bliss, where God had placed them, or from any abodes, at the pleasure of a public exhibitor, making money of them whenever an audience will collect and pay. The idea is outrageous and revolting.—*Zoist, April* 1853, *pp.* 86, 87.

*When the writer mentions "spirits," we are obviously to understand him to use the word in its popular sense of *immaterial* beings, those imaginary creation, human and angelic, of which we hear so much. For the existence of angels, called "ministering spirits," we must repair to the Bible; and from the same source learn also the difference between a being like man and an angel. The common notion about the constitution of spirits, certainly represents them as "bottomless fancies;" existences whose powers, as our author justly observes in a few lines forward, are inherent in "nothing."—*Editor.*

The Final Regeneration.—"Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the Regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Math. xix. 28. So I read the text. For it is

evident enough, our translators have mispointed it, referring the words "in the Regeneration," to that which went before, thus: "ye which have followed me in the Regeneration;" whereas they should be joined to the following words, thus: "ye which have followed me, in the Regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory," &c. "In the Regeneration"—what is that? Not in baptism, nor in the regeneration or renewing of the Spirit, as some have fancied; for neither of these significations will make good sense in this place; but in the Resurrection, which will be indeed a regeneration, or second generation of men to life, after that life which they had in their first generation was extinguished. Which second generation, or production of men to life, is more properly the work of God, as being effected solely by his Divine power, without the concurrence of any second causes; whereas, in our first generation into the world, our parents were instruments. Hence those words of the Psalmist concerning Christ, Psal. ii. "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," are said by St. Paul to be fulfilled in him, when God raised him from the dead, Acts xiii. ver. 32, 33, "The promise which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again, as it is also written in the second Psalm, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." And hence also, all the godly are said at the Resurrection to become the childen of God, upon the very account of their being then raised by God to a blessed immortal life, Luke xx. 36, "They are called the children of God, being the children of the Resurrection." —*Bishop Bull.*

Assert Your Right.—*Maintain your right to form your own opinions inviolate!* Sign no creeds; subscribe no articles; bow to no council. If your minister asks you as a condition of his acknowledgment of your religious character, what opinions you hold, tell him that is a matter between you and God, and with which you must forbid him or anybody to interfere. If a Church says, "You must believe this or that, or we must expel you;" say boldly to them, "You shall not expel me,—I withdraw." Be ever mindful that your spiritual safety and honor do not depend upon any ecclesiastical association. Ever be courteous, but be ever faithful. Be ready to co-operate with any for God's and for man's sake; but never sacrifice your freedom. "Let no man take thy crown." To pursue this course may require more nerve, may entail some sacrifices, and will provoke much ill opinion, but be easy on these matters. Courage will come to the devout. Self-denial is the highest form of self-indulgence. Public opinion cannot control destiny. Goodness will be loved. Greatness—even though it be only of temper—will be respected. Fidelity will bring peace. Hard names will be uttered with the very hoarseness of malice; but hard names mean nothing and cannot hurt you. Take these things smoothly in good temper, and with much fear of God, and you will put your denouncers to shame. "Latitudinarianism," they will say. Ask them "What then?" "Infidelity," they will shout. Smile, and say "What then." "Damnation!" they will growl. Still smile, and say, "Very well, what then?" Poor things, they can go no further!—*The Youthful Enquirer Councelled and Encouraged.*

Bible Examiner for 1855.—We have about ten bound copies of last year's Examiner *perfect* or entire. Price $1.50, sent free of postage, under 3000 miles. We have also some 40 sets *in sheets* which are *imperfect*, lacking numbers 1, 2 and 3: these we will send gratuitously to any who will pay the postage. Any who are *new* subscribers, this year, may specially desire a set of these, as the latter part of last year contains a large part of the *Discussion* which has been continued into this year.

For the Examiner.

BIBLE vs. TRADITION.

BY T. P LEWIS.

Tune—"Rose of Allendale."

They tell us of a spirit land
Beyond the bounds of space
Where undressed spirits ever stand
Before Jehovah's face:—

But *inspiration* teaches plain,
The Kingdom shall be given
To saints, when Christ on earth shall reign—
This is the reign of Heaven.

They tell us of a happy home,—
A mansion in the air—
They tell us wait till death shall come,
And bid us enter there.

But *Scripture* says when Christ appears,
The graves shall then be riven,
And life shall swallow up our tears—
This is the reign of Heaven.

They tell us that the vile shall live,
In anguish, pain and grief;
Eternity no hope can give,
Nor death shall bring relief—

The Bible saith—good is the Lord,
His ways are just and even,—
Destruction is the sure reward,
Of all refusing Heaven.

Blest is the man who in his youth,
The yoke of Christ doth bear—
Blest are the souls who seek the truth,
And in its glories share.

Blest are the men both young and old,
Who for the truth have striven—
The Lord shall garner up the gold,
'Twill brightly shine in Heaven.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, APRIL 1, 1856. NO. 7.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year;

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

[From "Credibility of the Scriptures."]

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

BY J. H. M'CULLOH, M. D., BALTIMORE.

(Continued from p. 38.)

Agreeably to the plan laid down on page 186, we shall now examine the Epistles of Paul wherever he speaks of the officers or institutions observed in the Christian Churches of his day, that we may be able to determine the question whether the church stands upon the foundation of a divinely appointed constitution formally established by Christ or his apostles, or whether it be only the result of expediences adopted by pious persons as the best mode they could select for the edification of their disciples. In conducting this examination of Paul's Epistles, I shall take them up in their chronological order as estimated by learned men, instead of following the confused arrangement in which they stand in our translation of the New Testament.

It is commonly regarded by Biblical critics that the two Epistles to the Thessalonians were the earliest of Paul's writings, and that they were composed about A. D. 52, or about twenty years after our Saviour's ascension.

The first Epistle to the Thessalonians is written in the name of Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy, "to the church of the Thessalonians," *i. e.* to the congregation directly, and is continued in the same plural address to them throughout. In chapter v. 12, 14, however, they commend to the congregation certain persons who must be considered to stand in an ecclesiastical position among them, "and we beseech you brethren to know," (*i. e.* regard with affection,) "them which labor among you and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love, for their work's sake." As Paul says nothing about such persons having a divine commission, which would have been very suitable for him to have noticed on this occasion, I think the direct inference is they had no such appointment. But however this may be, the language of the Epistle is fully as applicable to the mere leaders of a prayer-meeting who were zealous in the Christian cause, and this being the case no one certainly has a right to assume that a divinely constituted ministry is implied.

The second Epistle to the Thessalonians was written by the same persons, in the same year as the first Epistle, but it contains no passage that has any reference to our present investigation.

Paul's Epistle to the Galatians was written also in the year A. D. 52. It contains no formal direction concerning the constitution of Christian Churches, but it has an important bearing on the subject in the fact that this epistle was written to counteract the influence of some Judaizing preachers of Christianity, who had opposed the doctrines taught by Paul concerning the uselessness of observing the law of Moses. Who these persons were we have not the smallest means of ascertaining, but we make two very important inferences from the facts stated: *first*, that there could have been no established systematic exposition of the doctrines of Christianity previous to this time, in contradistinction to the Mosaic institutions; and *secondly*, that the apostles could not have been regarded by the Christian brethren as a divine corporation established by Christ to legislate for the church, for had this been the case we cannot suppose Paul would have forborne to press the authority of the apostolic body upon the minds of the Galatians, as sustaining him in the doctrines he had taught them, and as opposing those persons against whom he wrote this epistle.

The next epistle of Paul was written to the Corinthians about A. D 57, or about twenty-four years after Christ had left the apostles. The first epistle was sent to the church (*i. e.* the congregation) in the joint names of Paul and Sosthenes. To fully appreciate the important testimony to be derived from 1 *Corinthians*, a few prefatory remarks are necessary. In *Acts* xviii. 1—11, an account is given of the arrival of Paul at Corinth, where he successfully preached the gospel under the encouragement of a vision from the Lord Jesus, who informed him he had "much people in this city." Paul remained there a year and six months, and established a church or congregation in that city, as we must necessarily presume under all the institutions, rites and ceremonies that characterized a truly Christian Church; for his visit to Corinth took place about *twenty-two years* after Christ is supposed to have given full instructions to the apostles on such subjects. We apprehend therefore it is impossible but that all things pertaining to the organization of the church at Corinth must have been established by Paul in the perfection of apostolic institutions.

Let us now examine this first epistle to the Corinthians, which according to the received chronology was written A. D. 56, *i. e. two years after Paul had personally organized their church.*—That the Corinthians had faithfully obeyed the formal injunctions of the apostle, is evident from *chap.* xi. 2. "*Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you.*" In the very next verse however, he commences with a censure upon a practice that had arisen among them *of women preaching to or exhorting the congregation.* This he condemns as a matter highly unbecoming in a woman, but not one word does he say against it as being a breach of any ecclesiastical organization established by him only *two years before.* And indeed how can we suppose such an usurpation of ecclesiastical functions could possibly have taken place, if the apostle had previously ordained bishops or presbyters as a class of men divinely constituted for the exclusive office of instructing the people in their religious obligations? The inference therefore is irrefragable, that the church officers at Corinth whether as bishops, presbyters, or deacons, held no ecclesiastical office under a divine commission, with such powers as are commonly conceded to them. They evidently had no greater authority than the leader of a lay prayer-meeting have with us at the present time.

This argument receives a further confirmation by the instructions given by the apostle to the *Corinthians* in the 12th and 14th *chapters;* for, after enumerating the various spiritual gifts that God had conferred upon different members of the congregation, which were to be exercised to the common edification, he specifies the persons possessing these gifts to be "first *apostles*, secondly *prophets*, thirdly *teachers*, after that *miracles*, then gifts of *healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.*" But not a single word does he say concerning bishops, presbyters, or deacons, by which eminent omission we plainly discern the absurdity of supposing that such persons could have been regarded by the apostles as a divinely organized body appointed for the religious government of the church. He then gives some instructions as to how persons should exercise their spiritual gifts; he expostulates with them concerning the disorderly manner in which their church exercises had been conducted, he then gives particular directions as to how *the prophets* should exercise their gifts, and expressly forbid *women to preach in the church.* All these expostulations or directions are so manifestly contradictory to the theory of an organized clergy having been ordained to exercise ecclesiastical functions in Christian churches, that it ought to be wholly unnecessary to enlarge further on the subject; but as there is such an amount of misconception in the Christian world respecting the original institutions of church assemblies, we deem it expedient to exhibit the reasoning of the apostle at full length.

The object of church meetings, and the mode in which their religious exercises were conducted in the time of the apostles are most clearly exhibited to us in this epistle to the Corinthians, and which nothing but the erroneous ideas which Christians have attached to the terms *prophet, and prophesying*, have prevented them from perceiving in all distinctness.

We have already shown (Vol. I. 203, &c.) that the word *prophet* merely signifies a religious or moral *teacher or exhorter*, and not a foreteller of future events, or one necessarily inspired of Jehovah to announce some particular revelation.—Such things indeed were done from time to time by the prophets, but they were not termed prophets on that account. It was because they were prophets, that Jehovah made use of them either to announce some future event or to make some communication from him to mankind. The ordinary misconception of Christians respecting the true character of those persons called prophets in the Scripture, is the less excusable, since the Apostle in this very epistle has given the clearest illustrations of the whole subject. Recognizing therefore the term prophet to signify only a person who *exhorted or who taught by exhortation;* and prophesying to mean nothing else than *the act of exhorting*, we shall find in the first epistle to the Corinthians (chaps. xii., xiii., xiv.) a clear exhibition by the apostle Paul as to what was the object of a Christian assembly and how its exercises were essentially conducted.

In chap. xii. the apostle speaks of the variety of spiritual gifts possessed by different Christian believers, but which however diversified he refers them all to the grace of God as having been bestowed upon individuals to be exercised to the general edification of the whole membership. He illustrates the position thus taken, by a comparison of these various spiritual gifts to the different members of a man's body, each of which in its particular function is essential to the perfect action of that physical organization which constitutes the man. After this comparison the apostle urges upon the Corinthians that no one ought to be puffed up by any supposed superiority of spiritual gift over others whom they might consider of less excellence of spiritual endowments. For, according to the illustration previously urged upon them, that every function of the natural body was alike essential to the health and vigor of the whole organization of the man, so the intellectual and spiritual power of each individual was in like manner essential to the spiritual welfare of the whole brotherly community.

In chap. xiii. he magnifies the principle of Christian *love*, or charity as rendered in our Bibles, over all spiritual gifts whatever, for he observes that without this love or charity such gifts were nothing more than the mere ringing sound of a brazen instrument of music.

In chap. xiv. he continues his discourse by urging them to perfect themselves in that love which he so greatly extols, admitting at the same time it was also very reasonable, that they should desire spiritual gifts. Of these gifts he especially recommends in preference "that ye may prophesy," *i. e.* exhort in a powerful and effectual manner. The apostle then compares the importance of the gift of being enabled to speak a variety

of languages, with the one by which a person was enabled to prophesy, *i. e.* exhort an assembly of believers, and he largely insists upon the superiority of the latter, by saying that though he spoke more languages than any one of the Corinthian Christians, yet in a congregation of believers he had rather speak five words to the instruction of those present, than to be able to speak ten thousand words in languages which the audience did not understand.

He then returns to the subject of prophesying, which it is impossible to interpret in any other sense than the mere act of exhorting, or of teaching by exhortation.—See chap. xiv. 22—25.

The apostle then roproves certain irregularities in their manner of prophesying, whereby confusion was sometimes occasioned by the over anxiety of different individuals to occupy the attention of the assembly: "how is it then, brethren, when ye come together," (*i. e.* to your church or place of religious assembly,) "every one of you hath a psalm, a doctrine, a tongue, a revelation, an interpretation," (*i. e.* something or other which they individually desired to press on the consideration of the assembly,) "let all things," says he, "be done to edifying."

He then instructs them as to the manner in which the prophets (*i. e.* those who exhorted) should exercise their gifts, and forbids any one to speak in any other language than that understood by the audience, unless there should be some one present who would interpret to them in their own tongue. Then follows a direction that only two or three prophets (*i. e* exhorters) should speak at any one meeting, and that some other person or prophet should finally *judge*, *i. e.* should make a practical application of what had been said by the several speakers, or correct any thing that had fallen from them which required correction.*

From what is said in the thirteenth verse, "if any thing be revealed to another (prophet) that sitteth by, let the first (prophet) hold his peace," the theologians have commonly attempted to get rid of the authority of this chapter as showing how religious assemblies were conducted in the days of the apostles, by asserting that the meetings above mentioned were not ordinary church assemblies, but of really inspired men under extraordinary influences, and as such, peculiar only to the apostolic age.

But there is nothing to justify such an interpretation, for though the language of the apostle is a little perplexed by the term "revealed," yet the context evidently shows there was no inspiration in the case, for, says he, "by observing such conduct as he commended to them, *ye may all prophesy one by one*, that all may learn, and all may be comforted."

The evident sense of the thirteenth verse therefore is, as substantially paraphrased by Macknight on the Epistles, "if any thing be revealed," (or more properly, *be suggested.*) "to another prophet, or person sitting by, let the first hold his peace," (*i. e. let him finish his discourse before the other attempts to speak.*) "for by thus waiting for each other, all may prophesy in turn," &c. That this is the true interpretation, must be evident from the manifest absurdity of supposing that the Spirit of God would reveal something to one prophet, which required him to interrupt another prophet then speaking under the influences of the same spirit. The observation of Paul is directly opposed to such a notion, for he immediately adds, "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets," *i. e.* that they can control themselves as not being under any divine *afflatus* that compels them to speak whether they will or not; for as he rationally observes, "God is not the author of confusion," (as would result from such supposed conflicting influences,) "but of peace as in all (other) churches of the saints." He then concludes his exhortation on the subject with, "let all things be done decently and in order."*

* Notwithstanding these clear directions of the apostle Paul, as to the spirit and manner in which a preacher ought to address himself to a Christian audience, we are continually scandalized with the vociferation, angry looks, and violent gesticulation with which some ministers of the gospel express themselves on any subject with which they see fit to patronize. Such men, half crazy with their arrogated orthodoxy and natural intolerance, are pleased to justify their conduct under the complacent assumption that they are of that class of preachers whom our Lord designated as *Boanerges*, or "sons of thunder." Our Saviour's words however admit of no such application. The word *Boanerges* iteslf, is of very uncertain signification, though it has undoubtedly a reference to the phenomenon of lightning, probably as to its penetrating and intense action. But that the term has no connection with noise or denunciation may be safely inferred from the persons to whom our Lord applied the term. (*Mark* iii 17.) Though we are unable to state the personal character of the apostle James, yet it must essentially have accorded with that of John's, since the term "sons of thunder," designated them both. What then was the character of the apostle John? That of being the gentlest and most amiable among our Saviour's disciples. One whose writings only express love and tenderness, and whose very last words, as related by tradition, were consonant with all the history of his previous life.

How then can a Christian audience tolerate a term bestowed by Christ upon the gentle spirit of "loving John," to be assumed by one, who in delivering his arrogant opinions, at the same time splits the ears of all near him by intonations of voice, vehement gesticulation, stamping, and clapping hands, that are only in keeping with a colonel of grenadiers storming a breach at the head of his regiment.

* This practice of several persons preaching or exhorting during the time of a Christian assembly, was preserved a long time afterwards in Christian churches. The rule by which different persons were to speak, in the second and third century, is laid down in the *Apostol. Constit. lib.* ii. *chap.* 57; "Let the presbyters, one by one, but not all, speak the word of exhortation to the people, and last of all the bishop," &c. See also *Bingam, Antiq. Christ. Church. lib.* xiv. *chap.* 4, who refers to Chrysostom, Basil, Greg. Nysen. Theodoret, Augustine, and Jerome as all testifying to such a practice.

Deeming what has been said upon this subject to be sufficiently clear, we now return to our more proper discourse as confuting the idea that any clergy or divinely constituted body of ecclesiastics are anywhere recognized in the Epistle to the Corinthians.

We learn from 1 *Corinth.* xi. 20, &c. that the Corinthians celebrated the commemoration of the Lord's supper in an irreverent manner without a proper discernment of the object of the institution. Paul therefore censures their practice in that particular, and instructs them concerning its import. But if Paul had appointed bishops, presbyters, or deacons, only *two years previously*, to the exclusive function of administering the sacraments, as our clergy arrogate to themselves, the apostle's censure would have been directed to the ecclesiastics who had permitted such gross irregularities to prevail in the church, for they only would have been to blame. Or, if it be supposed, though such a notion is incredible, that the people had borne down their ministers, and forced them to comply with the innovations, then surely Paul would have justified the ministers, and censured the people for their disobedience to those who had been expressly appointed under the institution of Christ to this exclusive function. There is nothing however said in this Epistle that gives the least countenance to any such supposition, but on the contrary every inference that common sense can deduce from the statements made, are that as the Corinthians had "kept Paul's ordinance," (1 *Cor.* xi. 2,) so his omission to censure a clergy in this matter, shows that no orghnization of clergy or ministers of the gospel as a divinely constituted body, could possibly have existed at Corinth in a church established by the apostle Paul *twenty-two years* after Christ had ascended to heaven.

The Epistles to the Romans is commonly supposed to have been written about A. D. 57 or 58. It is addressed by Paul in his individual character as an apostle, to the whole Christian congregation at Rome, whom he commends for their faith as a matter spoken of throughout the whole empire. After an elaborate exposition of certain principles of the Christian Dispensation, he then in chap. xii. 6, &c. addresses himself to the whole brotherhood, and exhorts them to exercise their various gifts in an orderly manner to a common edification. In chap. xiii. 1—7, he expressly requires the congregation to be obedient to the heathen magistracy. But he takes no notice whatever of any church officers, or of any reverence to which they were entitled. Special mention by name is made in the last chapter of the many individuals, female as well as male, who had exerted themselves in promoting the Christian cause. The first one mentioned is a woman named Phebe, who is styled in our translation *a servant*, but who according to the manner in which the noun masculine has been translated in other places, ought to have been rendered *a deaconess*, an officer, or rather a function that was distinctly recognized in the earlier ages of Christianity, but which gradually diappeared under the increasing corruption of after times. It is a most singular circumstance however, if there had been any ecclesiastical establishment at Rome at this time, that Paul should have omitted to remember such persons when he specially commends himself to twenty-eight private individuals whether men or women, by name.

I think we have therefore the fairest reason to believe that this church at Rome had been established on the prayer-meeting scheme, (see page 183,) by pious individuals who had brought with them the principles of Christianity to the imperial city, for with such a supposition the epistle to them accords perfectly, at the same time that it is wholly at variance with the supposition that there was any ecclesiastical organization of divine appointment then recognized in the church at Rome.

The second epistle to the Corinthians was written A. D. 58, a year after the former letter. There is nothing said in this epistle that has any direct bearing on the subject of our present investigation. We could make some strong inferences from direct passages, but as we apprehend we have a sufficient amount of evidence to produce from those that are direct, it is not deemed necessary to accumulate proofs less forcible in their application.

The Harvest of the Earth.

The following is an extract from an English Tract published in 1851, by the same author as our two previous extracts in EXAMINERS Nos. 2 and 3. The author we believe is a Clergyman of the Church of England.—*Ed. Examiner.*

We may now proceed to the more immediate object of this tract—namely, the connection between the Harvest of the Earth and the present position of the world. The point of time which we now appear to have reached, in the train of prophesy which leads on from the first vision of the book of Revelation to the great catastrophe of the fall of Antichrist. The fourteenth chapter commences with the vision of the First Fruits, which, acording to the *primary* fulfillment, may be applied to the Protestant converts gathered from the Papal world during the period of the Reformation; and who are, hereafter, to appear in glorified bodies at the period of the removal of the Church. This vision of the First Fruits is followed by the appearance of an angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlating Gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth; and this vision of the angel has been fulfilled in its *primary* sense, by the exertions of our various Missionary Societies, proclaiming the truth to almost every nation of the world; and literally to *every* nation, without exception, of the prophetic earth. Nor can it be said, as some have asserted, that the proper translation of the words being—not the "Everlasting Gospel," but the "Gospel of the Age," the prophesy must be applied to some future period, in which the *millenial* dispensation shall be universally proclaimed. For the "Gospel of the Age" does not, by any means, apply to the millennian alone; it refers to the Gospel suitable to the *then existing* age; and includes the

present Gospel which dwells chiefly on the *atonement* of Christ, as well as the Gospel hereafter to be preached which will also proclaim his personal advent and glory. So that the expression, "the everlasting Gospel," is one which bears a double signification, and may equally be applied to the first fulfillment, and to the second.

The vision of the flying angel is followed by that of another angel, who announces that Babylon the Great is fallen. And this vision appears to have received its *primary* accomplishment during the early part of this century; for it was then that Rome and the Papal Government fell completely under the power of revolutionary France; while the pope himself was carried prisoner to Fontainbleau. It was at this time that the world began to proclaim that Popery had fallen; and men fancied that Rome had received an irreparable injury. And it was then, in actual truth, that Popery *began* to fall, so that the angel might justly declare that Babylon had fallen; for whenever God has begun a work, it may be looked upon as *finished*. The second angel is followed by a third who warns men against the worship of the Beast, and the receiving of his mark. This vision seems to have been *primarily* accomplished in the first quarter of the present century, as well as ever since; for it was then that Popery began to revive, after the peace of Paris; and Protestants alarmed by this revival, commenced a more vehement attack upon the errors of the Church of Rome. It was then that the warnings of the Reformation were more loudly proclaimed, in consequence of the increased apprehensions which the revival of Popery had created.

The three angels seem, therefore, to have already been sent forth, so far as the *primary* fulfillment is concerned, And the same remark may be applied to the succeeding symbol, that beautiful one of the "Voice from Heaven." "I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, write; blessed are the dead which die in the Lord—from henceforth. Yea, saith the Spirit; for they rest from their labor." This symbol appears, also, to have received a *primary* accomplishment;—it evidently applies to the near approach of the Resurrection of the Just. The Resurrection is supposed to be at hand; and those who die in the Lord, at that day, are assured, for their consolation, that the time is short. Within a few years or days, they shall arise again. That this is the true meaning, appears from the use of the word, "henceforth." For, at all periods, those who die in the Lord, are blessed; nor could it justly be said that they are blessed from *henceforth*, more than at any other time, unless for some special and peculiar cause. The near approach of the first resurrection seems, therefore, to be announced by this Voice from Heaven, giving an assurance to those that die in the Lord, that the time of (their sleep) will endure only for an instant; and that when that instant shall have passed, they shall receive the recompense of their labors. "Their works do follow them." The voice from heaven, therefore, requires for its fulfillment, a public declaration that the Advent is at hand. It implies within itself a public announcement through the ministers of the gospel, that the Resurrection appears to be approaching. In other words, the Voice from Heaven is intended as the symbol of that period of the Church in which men shall announce that the Coming of the Lord is near. This period is not *general* but *special*. It is one fixed and appointed time preceding the Second Advent, and preceding it immediately. It is not applicable to *every* period; nor is it realized at any but one peculiar moment. But it appears as if this peculiar moment were already come. It is now, at least some years, since various prophetic works, announcing the nearness of the Advent, have been circulated throughout Christendom. Some of these works, perhaps all, have been chargeable with errors; but they have contained such force of truth and argument, as to waken the hearts of many, and to convince many more that the event is at hand. Through the influence of these works, interest has been excited; inquiry has been aroused; the Scriptures have been investigated; and a widely spread conviction has been created that the Lord is not far off. Thus it would appear as if the Voice from Heaven were already realized, and that its fulfillment has been carrying on for several years past. If this be admitted, we are now approaching the end of that particular crisis which is represented by the Voice, and are drawing near to that crisis which is to follow. Nor is it easy to deny the truth of this conclusion: for the Voice from Heaven must have *some* meaning or other. It cannot stand for *nothing*. But, if it mean anything, it must express the nearness of the Resurrection (as we have shewn already.) And, if so, what more can we expect; what more can we demand, than the multiplied and accumulated testimony which has been borne to this fact within the last ten or twelve years; and not only in this country, but abroad, especially in America. So that if the Voice from Heaven have not been realized, it seems impossible to say how it can be realized at all. For we well know that it will never be *universal*.

We now arrive directly at THE HARVEST OF THE EARTH.—The three angels have already been sent forth; the Voice from Heaven has already been heard; and the approach of the Resurrection has been proclaimed. If, then, we admit of only *one* fulfillment of prophecy, we seem to stand already at the termination of that crisis which is represented by the voice, and at the edge of that field which is whitened with the Harvest. And, if we believe in a *double* fulfillment, we appear, equally, to have arrived at the PRIMARY fulfillment of the Voice from Heaven, which is the immediate fore-runner of the *primary* fulfillment of the Harvest. In this position we find ourselves to-day; and are now placed in the interval between the crisis of the Voice, and the crisis of the Harvest. The subject is so solemn that one hesitates to encounter it; and even *conjecture* almost seems presumptuous! Yet, when we look back to the apparent accomplishment of all that goes before, we can hardly be presumptuous in conjecturing our position. We appear to stand in the interval described: the space that intervenes between the "Voice" and the Harvest. "And I looked, and

beho'd a white cloud, and upon that cloud one sat like unto the Son of Man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle." "And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud. Thrust in thy sickle and reap; for the time is come for thee to reap; for the Harvest of the Earth is ripe." "And he that sat on the cloud, thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the Earth was reaped———"

Such is the description of the Harvest of the Earth, which appears to be now not far away.—The Son of Man, himself, is the chief actor: it is he who reaps the harvest; but he waits till the appointed time, and does nothing without command. The long suffering of God has delayed the judgment of the Last Days, and therefore, the Harvest itself is delayed, until the wheat is more than ripe, and can be left no longer in the field.—This is THAT DAY AND THAT HOUR, of which no man knows, nor the angels of God, nor even the Son of himself; but the Father only. But when the Harvest shall be more than ripe, the day and the hour shall have then arrived; the command shall be given to reap. And the Harvest shall be succeeded by the Judgments of the Vintage.—Having heard the Voice from Heaven for so many years, testifying to the nearness of the Resurrection, we may now look forward to the gathering of the Harvest. The voice from heaven may grow louder and louder for a while. Every day may add to the loudness of testimony, and to the number of the testifiers. But the Voice having so long been heard, we can see no interval between the present moment and the Harvest except only the *remaining period* of the Voice! This is a solemn thought!—Can it be, that we already stand upon the edge of the Harvest field, and know not how soon the reaping of earth may commence? How soon the Church may be warned by that last warning cry, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh!" And then, after another interval, too short to be considered, the Church shall be removed.—The Wise Virgins shall enter into the Heavenly City, and the Foolish be shut out It would be presumptuous to insist upon these statements; but it really does appear as if no interval existed between the present day, and the gathering of the Church, but only the concluding period of the Voice from Heaven.

There is one subject of importance connected with this question, which ought not to be passed over. We mean the Parable of the Ten Virgins. Some persons are of the opinion that the Foolish Virgins are the representatives of those true believers who are finally saved, through faith in the *atonement*. but who in the mean time, are to be left behind upon earth, *after* the removal of the Church, because they have refused to believe in the Second Advent, or in the Resurrection. We mention this opinion as worthy of consideration; but cannot feel by any means certain as to its correctness. It is not absolutely *impossible* but that some true believers may be left behind, on account of their deliberate and inveterate hostility to the Second Coming of the Lord; and it would be wise in them to reflect upon this before it is too late. At the same time, it must be admitted that the Unwise Virgins appear rather to be symbols of the unbelieving, yet professing world. The Lord addresses them in words expressive of *reprobation*. "Verily I say unto you, I know you not." These words might possibly be applied even to true believers with reference to some special case, such as admission to the Heavenly City *before* the conclusion of the Day of the Lord.—But this is far from being probable, and it is much safer to apply them to the mere professing world, which professes on every Sabbath day to desire the coming of the Lord, and yet never longs for it. Which professes to seek an heavenly city. and yet rests all its hopes upon earth. And they may, equally, be applied to a multitude of persons who believe to the utmost in the Second Advent, and the Kingdom of Christ: who have embraced all the highest doctrines of Scriptures; and who *speak* with the deepest interest of the "Coming of the Lord;" and yet have neither saving faith, nor sanctity of life. Who neither apply to the blood of Christ to cleanse them from all sin; nor to his Spirit to sanctify their hearts. Such persons are precisely as the Unwise Virgins;—they go forth to meet the Lord, by professing to look forward to his Advent, but they take no oil along with them. They are destitute of the Holy Spirit, and shall, therefore be shut out from heaven.

In the progress of those events which seem now to be approaching, there are various stages to be passed. In the first place. as we have observed, the Voice from Heaven, in its primary fulfillment, is to precede the primary fulfillment of the "Reaping of the Harvest;" and we may now be in the interval between the two. In the next place, there occurs that expression in the 16th chapter —"Behold I come as a thief." A warning which is given before the last Vial, and which is, therefore, some time previous to the end. This warning appears already to have been given. For every one who has written or spoken of the Coming of the Lord, may be considered as having realized this warning. Within the last few years, how many have announced that the Coming of the Lord was at hand; and though mistaken as to actual time, it by no means follows that any one of them has been mistaken as to the *fact*. A few years more or less amount to nothing, when compared with the magnitude of the event. So great a scene may be contemplated far off, without impairing its magnificence. Thus the warning cry, "Behold I come as a thief," like the "Voice from Heaven," may be regarded as fully realized at the present; and as having been realized for the last twenty years. But there is also another and much shorter stage, which precedes the Removal of the Church; and which has not yet been reached.—We mean the final warning, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh." This cry is immediately to precede the Removal of the Church; for, after the cry has been raised, there is not even time for the Foolish Virgins to procure oil for their lamps.—There is no time left for preparation. unless for a mind already prepared. The Wise Virgins have just a moment given, to trim their lamps; but the Unwise, have no interval sufficient to rekindle

theirs. This stage is, therefore, very short, and may occupy but a *few days or weeks;* and it does not appear that we have reached it yet. But as the former stages had, each a separate point of time, and a distinctive announcement, as we may reasonably suppose that this last stage of all will have its *distinctive sign*. Some remarkable event—perhaps some strange appearance in the heavens—may be the signal that "The Bridegroom cometh." Or, at least, a sense of unusual expectation may be awakened in the Church; some unprecedented feelings or foreboding, of some great event; or some louder testimony as to the nearness of the end. And then shall the Wise Virgins arise, and shall trim their lamps.

It should be remembered, in these inquiries, nothing is positively asserted. No attempt is made to fix the hour, the day, or even the year.—But the general conclusion is arrived at, that the Harvest of the Earth is near; and that the prophetic events which were immediately to precede it, have received already their *primary* fulfillment. The *secondary* fulfillment (if at all) will *follow* the removal of the Church. The Voice from Heaven seems already to have been heard; and, if so, the Harvest is not far off. A further proof that the end is at hand, may be found in the rapid increase of PROPHETIC LIGHT. It is to be observed that God never throws away his light, nor wastes his gifts. He gives us as much as is required, and nothing more. But the increase of prophetic light would be an useless expenditure were any long period to remain between the present moment and the end. If the present generation were to die off before the Coming of the Lord, the greater part of the light which we now have, would be in vain. It is only useful for those who are to encounter the actual events, or the tyranny of the Last Antichrist. Let us, especially, take the case of the Removal of the Church; the expectation of this Removal is, indeed, *always* of benefit, but it is evidently of no greater use to *one generation than to another*, except in the case of the very generation itself which is to be actually removed. In this case, alone, is any *special* advantage to be gained by the knowledge of this truth, or by the expectation of this event. Yet we find, that since the time of the Apostles, the Lord has suffered this truth to be forgotten, and at length to be utterly unknown. But suddenly, at the present day, he has revived it once more, with an unlooked for energy, and has aroused the thoughts of multitudes to contemplate the event. And, as the Lord never throws away his light, this one fact may be considered as an evidence that the time is near; for as we have said, such an expectation would have been of no greater use to *the present age* than to any former one, unless the Removal of the Church were to take place within the time of the present generation. And therefore, so sudden a revival of this expectation, renders it most probable that the existing generation shall witness the event.

How many are there who adopt the liturgy of our Church, with almost superstitious fervor, and yet who never reflect upon the prophetic hope which it contains, "Give PEACE in our time, O Lord!" "That it may please thee to give unto ALL nations unity, peace, and concord." "Beat down SATAN under our feet." Again,—in the burial Service, "Shortly to accomplish the number of thine Elect, and to hasten THY KINGDOM." All these are expressions of prophetic hope.—They all look forward to the reign of the Messiah. Yet they are repeated, nay, admired, by those who have no estimate of their sense.—Who expect no Kingdom, but that skeleton of Christianity which may be set up by human hands, to misrepresent the Church, and to scare away the visit of Angels. But it is not so in the mind of God!—The mighty Globe, on its invisible axis, turns round from day to night, and from night to day. And the Destiny of man, suspended on the counsels of God, has rolled round, for six thousand years, from light to darkness, and from darkness to light. The Son of Righteousness shall arise, and an endless morning come.

But, whatever view we may take of THE HARVEST OF THE EARTH, it has now become evident that some GREAT CRISIS is at hand. All the elements, both of good and evil, are beginning to be separated, that their distinctive forces may be more vigorously employed in the great day of Almighty God. The contending hosts of Christ and Antichrist, mingled together for ages in the crowd of life, are drawing out into divisions, as if preparing for their last conflict. * * * In the meanwhile, the Spirit of Truth is gathering out the Elect, and drawing them more closely to himself, and more widely from the world. France, Italy, even infidel Germany, are accomplishing the number of the Elect, and hastening THE KINGDOM. Those who believe in the Coming of the Lord, are daily more convinced of its approach; and those who as yet, believe it not, are preparing in heart, to welcome its arrival. The Saints are becoming habituated to the stupendous change which is to surprise them in a moment. The Ungodly are hardened more and more in the awful blasphemy that man is sufficient to himself! Poets philosophers, statesmen, artists, even Our false preachers themselves, are extending the delusion. The forces of Earth and hell are advancing their outposts within the territories of Heaven. The Church, as well as State, is infected by the principle of SELF-DEPENDENCE, the sure fore-runner of Antichrist himself.

Every sign of the approaching Crisis has now appeared. The very deadness of the calm is a symptom of the storm. The violence of the judgment will be in proportion to its delay. When men cry "Peace and safety," "Then sudden destruction shall come upon them; and they shall not escape." "For, behold, the Lord cometh out of his place, to punish the inhabitants of the Earth for their iniquity; the Earth also, shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her *slain*." But to those who rest upon the atonement of Christ, this invitation is directed—"Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee. Hide thyself, as it were, for a little moment; until the indignation be overpast."—"Watch, ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be counted worthy to escape ALL these things

that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man!"

Torquay, England, June 1851.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, APRIL 1, 1856.

PREACHING AND PREACHERS.—We may differ very much in our views on these topics from some of our respected brethren. We fully agree with DR. MCCULLOH, that the Scriptures do not sustain the idea of any particular "persons having a divine commission to preach the gospel," since the days of the apostles. It is setting up this claim that has exalted these self-styled "*Ministers*" above the *Bible*. But says one, "*The Gospel must be preached.*" We ask—*What* is *the gospel?* and *where* is it? It is in the Bible, and to be found there, or it is not. If it *is* there, then the Bible is the Minister or Preacher, and is "divinely commissioned" to make known the gospel; and to pretend that there are men *specially* called of God, in these days, to "preach the gospel"—as that phrase is usually understood—is to suppose the *Bible gospel* is imperfect, and *not* "a sufficient rule both of our faith and practice."—The claim, therefore, set up that some men have a *special* or *supernatural* "call to preach the gospel"—*i. e.* to travel from place to place, or to be "settled" in *one* place, to tell men what the Bible means—is, we are persuaded, a mistaken notion; and opens the door to divisions, strife, discord, and a corrupting of the word of God.

The apostle PETER in addressing the "strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," saith to them all—"*Ye* are a royal priesthood," &c. See 1 Peter 1 : 1, and 2 : 9. Such are *all* true Christians. No one in particular—since the Canon of Scripture was filled up—is any more a divinely appointed Minister than another. All are bound to use their gifts and graces in the best and most efficient manner—that their time and circumstances will permit; and each is equally bound to "provide for his own, specially those of his *own house*," or "he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." See 1 Tim. 5 : 8.

How then can any man say, God has given him a "special call to preach the gospel"—in these days—while such a work, as commonly understood, may oblige him to leave his wife and children, or dependents unprovided for, and perhaps to suffering and want? We have no faith in such *calls:* they are much more likely to be a delusion than a reality: and we know the idea is the occasion of much delusion and fanaticism. The experience and observation of the last twenty years have made this demonstration to our mind. These special-called preachers succeeding one another at different times and places—often times preach *a* gospel as diverse one from the other as the language of Babel; yet all professing they have a "divine commission to preach the gospel"! Some of them, surely, must be mistaken. All of them, we think, are mistaken in *one thing, viz: the nature of their call.* They have no such call *from God* as they suppose. Hence it is useless, if not impious, for them to blame the Church, and denounce its members, for not supporting their *families* while they are guilty of neglecting to "provide for their own houses": the apostle Paul saith, such "walk *disorderly*," and he exhorts, "that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread." See 2 Thes. 3 : 6—12.

Piety is first *personal*, towards God. Second, *social*, beginning with our own households, towards which every duty enjoined in the gospel is to be strictly regarded and faithfully discharged. Next comes the relation to community around us; "especially unto them who are of the household of faith." See Gal. 6 : 10. Here our obligations are mutual. Each member of Christ's body—the Church—is bound to do all that his time and circumstances will permit for the edification, or building up of that Church and its individual members. In the exercise of the various gifts in the body it will doubtless be found that some will possess gifts more frequently called into use than others; and the Church may desire to make use of that person's gifts more generally or constantly than consists with his obligations to his household. If this is the case, it is the duty of that body to relinquish their desire or make such provision to meet his obligation to his family as shall be satisfactory to him and them. They have no right to use the gifts God has bestowed on any member of their body so as to cause him to violate his first social relation and obligation.

But for an individual to affirm he has a supernatural call from God to go abroad to preach the gospel," and set up the claim that the Church *must* support him and his family or "*be damned*,"—while he leaves them—seems to us to be *lording* it over God's heritage in a way that may endanger the person's own *eternal life.* If persons thus go out, the Church are at pefect liberty to withhold support from them, if they choose. But if these persons, or others who pretend to no such special

call, are *invited*, to visit places at a distance from their homes, *then* those who invited them are bound, by all principles of honesty and religion, to pay their expenses and give them an ample compensation for their time, whether they are pleased or displeased with the ministration. Not to do this would be dishonesty and robbery. But it is quite another matter when one goes unasked and uninvited. Then those who hear him must be their own judges whether the gospel requires them to help him to continue his travels.

We maintain *the Bible* is the testimony of the *only* divinely called and commissioned Preachers of the gospel. Where that has not been sent let it be done; and let it preach. If men will "not hear Moses, the Prophets," nor Jesus Christ and his Apostles, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead"; nor are we to expect that God will "divinely commission"—in these days—a set of men to tell the people what He means by the words of life He has sent unto them. They may offer any help their time and circumstances will permit to aid in the work of leading the *attention* of men to the words God has given; but let them beware of claiming for themselves to be teachers by special authority, or divine appointment; such place themselves between God's truth and those to whom God has sent that truth.

For the "Bible Examiner."

The Prayer of King Henry VIII. in Hell.

Mr. Geo. Storrs,—Sir:—The following is the Prayer of King Henry VIII. of England, who has now been in Hell about *three hundred years*.

"Lord, I was created by thy sovereign pleasure, without my own will; I did not desire to be made, much less to be born in such a relation to Adam, whereby I brought a sinful nature into the world with me: but I was united by thy power and pleasure to a body which had the seeds of sin and misery in it: there were strong appetites and violent passions mingled with my flesh and blood, which I myself had no hand in procuring; they fermented in me with much vehemence, and I was tempted to many excesses. I made some resistance at first, and many times tried to subdue them; but I was overcome; at last I suffered myself to be carried away by the stream of these sinful affections and appetites, which I could not possibly avoid, nor easily subdue. Is it agreeable to thine equity, O blessed God, to punish such a poor wretch with everlasting torments? And can thy mercy continue to see this my misery for ever and ever, and not help me? I entreat thee, O thou Almighty Author of my being, to destroy and annihilate me utterly soul and body; take away this being, which I never asked nor desired; nay, which I would not have consented to accept, among the sinful race of mankind, because, in this track of generation and existence, I stood much more likely to be *miserable*, than to be happy."

Remarks by Editor of Examiner.—Who sent us the foregoing we do not know. It was accompanied with a notice of "*A Course of Theological Lectures*" by "Prof. Geo. Bush, Rev. B. T. Barrett," and "Rev. Samuel Beswick." The Lecture by Barrett was, "*Hell—What it is, and where it is.*" Doubtless the person or persons who sent us the notice thought to accompany it with a *fancy* prayer would convince us the soul is immortal. If he or they are anxious to learn the effect of their pious or *impious* labor they can have it in a few words—Men generally use the best arguments they have; and as they have presented us nothing but *a fable*, we conclude they have nothing else to sustain their notion of an immortal soul. We are inclined to think they are more familiar with "*hell*" than with God and His truth.

The Great Business of Life consists in forming a Christian character—breathing a Christian Spirit and diffusing Christian light—"the light of Life."

With many "the chief end of man" lies in self justification, self exaltation, and self promotion.

Paul was a Christian. With him it was "a small thing to be judged of men's judgment."—His all was with God!

The Pharisee was sensitively alive to every breath of the popular will. With him the judgment of man was every thing. He could, in imagination manage to get along well with God! The chief concern was to manage to keep out of the light of God, and so secure the good opinion of men.

In these circumstances it is ours to cast "our care on Him, who careth for us. Trust also in Him and He shall bring it to pass." 1 Pet. 5: 7; Ps. 37: 1—10.

A testimony to the truth is to be given "in season and out of season." Our manner may be more or less imperfect. God is judge. But it is a "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" to let our "light shine"! We are not to wait to see that every body or any body, will be pleased before we speak—nor whether any poor worm, will be exposed or defended. No, no, God and truth are supreme. It is ours to let it shine. God's truth like God's lightning, asks no leave to flash on any one. If I, or any one else is wrong, woe be to him or me if we will not admit and rectify that wrong! God's plan now is the standard;

for "*God*, the mighty God hath spoken"! Ps. 50 : 1–6.

The opposite is not Christian in word or spirit. "The way" to be Christian is not "yea and nay" —It is not favoritism. Its "eye is single." May our "eye be single," and we "full of light."

J. B. Cook.

The Sadducees partly Right.

Dear Bro. Storrs:—Much reflection upon our Saviour's discourse with the Sadducees has convinced me that the true import of Luke 20 : 37, 38, is expressed in the following praraphrase :

"Now that the dead (the deceased righteous) are (to be) raised, even Moses shewed at the bush. (Exo. 3.) when he calleth the Lord—the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For (*i. e.* God's being the God of the Patriarchs proves the resurrection I preach, *because*) he (God) is not (as you Sadducees must be aware He is not. from the fact that in the writings of Moses, to which you appeal, He no where declares himself to be) a God of the dead, (the *eternally* dead, *viz.* the deceased wicked, who, we agree, are never to be "made *alive*,") but of the living : (the temporarily *dead*, [or those who *shall live again*] *viz* : the deceased righteous :) for (*i. e.* I employ the words 'the living' *because*) all (whose death is *temporary*, as distinguished from the death of the wicked, which is [according to your belief and my teaching] *eternal*) live unto him" ("who * * * calleth things that be not as though they were.")

I will now give the two verses *without* my paraphrase, so that the merits of the latter may be the more readily judged of by the reader.

"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead but of the living : for all live unto him."

The argument of our Lord, as I understand it, is this : The deceased wicked are *perishsd forever ;* about this there is no disagreement between us. But you Sadducees, in opposition to the doctrine promulgated by me, affirm that deceased *saints* are *also* eternally dead, and thus you make *their* condition and that of the wicked dead to be *precisely the same.* But that you are in error on this point is clearly shown by a declaration found in the writings of Moses, which you receive as true ; for in them you are told that the Lord is the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. But the *relation* here brought to view, is nowhere in the Pentateuch said to exist, and hence it does not exist, between God and the *eternally* non-existent, (namely, *the wicked,*) and it is thus seen to be *peculiar* to the *righteous.* If this be so,it evidently *implies* a *privilege* in reserve for dead saints. But it could not imply *anything* if they meet an *eternal extinction of being* in common with the wicked. Therefore, they are not thus extinct, but will attain unto a resurrection from the dead.

In support of the foregoing view I would submit two considerations which in my mind are decisive.

1. It makes "*the dead*," of whom "God is not a God," in verse 38, to refer to an *existing reality*, while the expositions heretofore put forth by believers in the unconsciousness of the dead uniformly construe the words as *hypothetical.* Perceiving no good reason to the contrary, I am compelled to believe that by "*the dead*," in verse 38, Jesus just as certainly meant *some body* as he did by "*the living*" in the same verse and by "*the dead*" in the 37th. I am of course aware that to admit my view on this point, is to yield the notion of the living again of the wicked dead ; for it is perfectly obvious that if by "*the dead*" Christ designated the *deceased wicked*, they must remain eternally under the dominion of the "King of Terrors." If the *hypothetical* view was to have been expressed, it seems to me other language would have been employed by our Lord. Had he said—"*If* the Patriarchs were *eternally* dead, as you Sadducees claim they are, the Lord could not be their God,"—his words would not even suggest the interpretation I contend for, while he would nevertheless have asserted *all* that those believe he *did* assert who affirm that *all* Adam's posterity are to be "made *alive*" by a resurrection.

2. The view I have presented, it will be seen, does not make a *vital* part of the proof "that the dead are (to be) raised" to rest upon the *ipse dixit* of our Lord. This point is very important.—It was entirely proper for Jesus to *explain* his doctrine of the resurrection, and remove the erroneous impressions entertained by the Sadducees respecting it,—but when he undertook to prove to them *from* "*the book of Moses*" that the dead *would rise*, it is certain he would draw from *that* source *all* that was essential to his argument.—Now I presume all will admit that the fact that "*God is not a God of* the dead" *was* thus *essential* ; and it so happens that, upon my view of its import, it is clearly, though perhaps inferentially, taught in the Pentateuch. The *hypothetical*

theory, on the contrary, gives "the book of Moses" credit *only* for the fact that God is the God of the Patriarchs; the other important consideration, *viz*: that "God is not a God of *the dead*," it must regard either as a self-evident truth, or as a fact resting wholly upon the authority of the Great Teacher! We may be sure our Lord would not give his wily adversaries the advantage which *such* an explanation supposes. He put them "to *silence*," and this he could only do by an appeal to authority which consistency would not permit them to gainsay,

On the phrase "THE LIVING," verse 38, I remark that, as it is not *qualified* in the text, I suppose it embraces *all* the dead who will ever "be made alive." But as it embraces none but those whose God the Lord is, and as "God is not a God of the" *wicked* dead, it follows that the latter class are dead in the Sadducean sense—hopelessly and finally so.

I have some thoughts on verses 35 and 36 which I must reserve for a future article; if they are correct, they strongly corroborate the conclusions presented in this.

On this intensely interesting subject I want the *truth* and that alone. If I have made myself understood in this letter, I will be under deep obligations to our dear BRO. GREW if he will show in the "EXAMINER" wherein he believes me wrong. His strictures shall receive the most careful and candid consideration. If he is convinced that my positions are in harmony with "the law and the testimony," he will, of course, make the fact known. As my name can be no particular service to any one, at present, allow me to subscribe myself MACKNIGHT, JR.

March 6, 1856.

From T. P. Lewis, Cooperstown.

Bro, Storrs:—I have much that I wish to communicate through the columns of the EXAMINER; but want of talent, as a writer, and a consequent fear of occupying space in your paper which others can occupy to so much greater advantage, restrains me from writing much. As to the manner of conducting the EXAMINER, though I have been silent, yet I have felt intense interest in the subject. In my view, there are two decidedly important objects, to be secured in its publication.—*First, the manner of publication* should be of a character calculated to spread the true light of the gospel of Christ as revealed in the word, which object I think, has been very successfully attained, since I have been a subscriber for the paper.—*Secondly, the circulation of the paper* should be increased. This, I deem very important.

You may write and publish pure sentiments, sound doctrine, Scripture expositions, gospel sermons, &c., yet you can scarcely hope to affect those who never read your paper. Here, I confess, I was averse to raising the price of the paper from one to two dollars at the commencement of the present Vol. Not that I blame the *Editor* for this, for he evidently has done the best he could. I was averse to it from the fact it curtailed the circulation of the paper. There were several in this vicinity, rather indifferent as to our doctrines, yet at one dollar per annum would have subscribed, and become permanent subscribers. At the present price such, in spite of my plea to the contrary, will turn away saying: "What! two dollars for that small paper! I can't subscribe."—So it is with us here, and I presume, as human nature is the same, so it is in others places.

Now what shall be done? Nothing perhaps can be done to obviate this shutting up of the light till the commencement of a new Vol. I will suggest a plan, and the brethren will have time between this and the commencement of the next Vol. to consider its merits, if it has any.

This work *can*, and *should be* accomplished by the present subscribers of the EXAMINER. But how? Let each subscriber, at the commencement of the next volume, subscribe for two or three copies—as the case may require—keeping one for their own use, and disposing of the other one or two copies among their friends who will be apt to become permanent subscribers. Such can be found in almost every community. This done, and the circulation of the BIBLE EXAMINER, becomes tripled, or at least doubled, and the *Editor* is relieved of a heavy burden now hanging upon him. Think of it brethren, and let the light shine. I think the project of issuing the paper weekly had better be abandoned, at least till its semi-monthly issue is placed on a firm basis.

Bro. J. P. Cowles, of Delaware Co., has recently preached in this vicinity on the doctrine of life through Christ alone, and some are inclined to investigate. Others oppose it—not manfully, and openly,—but clandestinely. The Priests of the day seem to be well versed in what politicians would call "Secret, underhanded wire-pulling."—These gentry have a "holy horror" against anything, and every thing, that brings their "craft in danger."

Five years ago I did not dream that "priest-craft" had such a powerful sway over our people in this country as I have since found it to have. But where there is a fluttering and squirming in the camp of the enemy I always suspect somebody is wounded. The best way for us is, in such cases, to load with the right kind of amunition, take deliberate aim, and fire again.

Bro. Cowles seems to be a man capable of doing good. The Lord be with him and all others who preach the word. I confess I have a "doubt" relative to "Respondent's" views concerning the wicked dead in the future. I still think that resurrection—Gr. *Anastasis*—is correctly defined by "Anthropos" on Immortality, page 78, *viz*: "A rising up, to live again, recover life. It is a re-living a re-standing." If this were not so the "resurrection of the just" would be a poor pledge of their future *life*. And if the

resurrection of the just brings them to life I cannot see clearly why the resurrection of "them that have done evil" should not bring them to life also. The duration of this life, to which the wicked are brought, must be settled by Bible testimony, as also, that of the just. But we agree in the grand finale that all the wicked will God destroy, and that the righteous shall have "eternal life." As long as the EXAMINER is open to both sides of this, and other Bible questions, I have no reason to bid you "farewell." May the Lord help us to manifest the Spirit of Christ in our lives and intercourse with the world, and crown us in his Kingdom.

Yours in Love.

From J. P. Cowles, Griffin's Corner.

Bro. Storrs:—Inasmuch as I had something to say before the discussion upon the resurrection of the wicked commenced, having a tendency to urge it on, it may be proper for me to add something, now it appears to be brought to a close.

I had never fairly investigated the subject, therefore I was anxious to do so.

Before the discussion commenced, I was quite strong in the faith that the wicked would have a resurrection to life, that they might have the sentence of the second death passed and executed upon them; still there were doubts in my mind with respect to the truthfulness of this position.

Having carefully examined the arguments upon this great question, as they have appeared in the EXAMINER, I am constrained to say, that the order of things, in my mind, are reversed; for, I now quite strongly believe that the wicked will never be raised to life; still, some doubts exist as to the truthfulness of this position.

The only text used in the affirmative of this question, which has not been disposed of to my satisfaction is, Rev. 1: 7.

It is admitted, I believe, upon the part of the negative, that the coming of Christ here spoken of is his second coming. Now it is predicated of that second coming of Christ that "they also which pierced him" shall see him. If this objection can be removed, I think I can manage the rest.

Again, I would like to ask, Does not this view of the *non-living* again of the wicked effectually cut off the argument upon the return of the Jews to Palestine, as held by some?

One almost insurmountable barrier against the living again of the wicked is *the hope* of the church. Almost all who hold the truth upon the great life question, believe that that hope lies in the *resurrection*.

Now, Paul represents the wicked, in Eph. 2: 12, as "being *without* HOPE" in the world. If the hope of the Church lies in the resurrection, certainly, according to this language, the wicked can never be raised, or be made alive from the dead.

I cannot refrain from remarking, that all must admire the Christian spirit in which this discussion has been conducted. How unlike the spirit of Prof. Mattison has been that of Bro. Grew.

Yours in Love.

REMARKS BY RESPONDENT.—In reply to Bro. COWLES' difficulty on Rev. 1: 7, perhaps a word of explanation may be given with profit. The expression "*they* also which *pierced* him" can hardly be understood in a literal sense, for the reason that *one* only literally "pierced" Jesus, and he a Roman soldier. Yet we find figuratively it is spoken of persons who rejected Christ, as Paul speaks of some who *crucified* "the Son of God afresh," Heb. 6: 6. So in Zechariah 12: 10, there is a time spoken of when the LORD saith, "I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplications: and they shall look upon me whom *they have pierced*," &c. Thus, it seems, an act of *one* is spoken of as if done by *all;* or, rather, the act of one is, by a figure of speech, taken to represent the conduct of such as reject Christ. It is not therefore necessary to suppose that the persons living and acting at the time of Christ's actual death are made *alive* to see him; but that, not only "the kings and priests unto God shall see him," but "they also," who have *rejected* or "pierced" Christ, by refusing his service—who are alive when he returns to the earth—shall "see him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him":—*epi; because, about. concerning*, or *on account* of him. The *living* wicked, or rejecters of Christ, will find an end to their mocking and scoffing, so characteristic of these days, and to increase till Christ shall come and bring their scoffing to an end, and turn their laughter to *mourning*. An awful day to the living wicked; but nothing hinted or intimated of the wicked dead being made *alive* to witness the scenes of that day, any more than the wicked dead were made alive in the days of Noah.

The question of Bro. COWLES, whether this view does not "cut off the argument on the return of the Jews to Palestine, as held by some"? we cannot answer till we know who the "*some*" are to whom he refers, and what their particular views are; we can only say, it does not interfere with any views *we* hold on the subject; but we do not wish to enter on that topic at present.

WHEN we consider the tenderness of God's promises, the minute assurance of his care, and the common and bountiful blessings we partook of while in a state of nature, how can it be that we are ever lacking in confidence and trust, especially while the cry of Abba, Father, is in our hearts, and we are permitted to draw intimately nigh in secret prayer.

* From Jacob Grim.

Plymouth Township, Pa., March 17, 1856.

Dear Bro. Storrs:—I still hold my meetings, and preach every Sunday night. I have quite a good attendance, the people seem quite attentive. I spoke last evening of the promise of God to his Son Jesus; that he should be heir of David's Throne; and the necessity of a resurrection of the Dead in order that it may be fulfilled. I do not think I ever saw persons pay better attention or seem more interested than they. I spoke a week ago against Spiritualism, showing its absurdity when compared with Bible Truth.

I feel quite interested in the last news from Europe. It seems as if France was going to play the trick on England, and show the world that he is the Beast. I have been somewhat amused in reading Dr. Berg's Lectures on the Prophecies; and have some inclination to review him; but it seems like labor thrown away.

Yours, in Christ.

How to be Rich in Heaven.

If it is prudent to provide for the time to come, how much more so to provide for eternity! While to be rich in this world is the passion of thousands, to be rich in the next be mine. An appetite after earthly grandeur, betrays a mean spirit, and a base soul; but an ambition to be great in heaven, is worthy of an heir of God, of an expectant of glory: for it is to the honor of the supreme Potentate, that all his subjects be nobles, be priests, be kings.

In this short life-time is the foundation laid of things of eternal moment, and the wisdom that is from above will teach me to send all my treasures thither. It deserves little or no pity to be poor in this world, but poverty in the other is deplorable beyond the reach of comparison. And yet, according to the capacity of glorified saints, shall that same undiminished fulness be possessed in greater or lesser degree.

"How rich died he?" is the speech of fools at the decease of an acquaintance or friend. But none ever die rich but the saints; for, how can that man be said to die rich, when the very moment of his dissolution robs him of his all?

"Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven" is the admonition of the dear Redeemer. Let me, then, lay down an imperfect plan to myself, how to be rich for eternity.

1. Then, pre-supposing that I am in a gracious state, I must have a Christian contempt for the world. No man ever filled his coffers with sand; no monarch ever wore the pebble in his crown; so the soul that lays up his treasures in heaven, will not concern himself with perishing trifles.—If my affections are not weaned from the creature, and set on things above, I shall be but poor in the world to come.

2. I must be watchful in all things. The man that is anxious to be rich will not waste a penny; so must I watch mine actions, my thoughts, my words. Again, I must watch for God against all my secret sins, and also to reprove the transgressor. A bold and sincere reproof of sin, is a stroke against the enemies of the King, from which a palm of victory shall spring in the world of glory. I must also speak in commendation of the good land, that others may be encouraged to set out for the land of promise. Again, I must watch against carnal sorrow. Should the heir of a crown lament the loss of a feather? What can death do in his family who is the resurrection and the life? It may separate them a little while, but it is only to meet again forever. Worldly riches give their owners joy, but joy in the Lord increases spritual riches. So I must guard against carnal delight; none of the gay things of time must be objects of affection. It would be mean for a noble personage to be charmed with a stable, who, has a palace prepared for him; mean for an heir of God to sit down and feed on the refuse of the creation.—Again, I must beware of carnal company. These are bankrupts that will spend at my expense, and whatever loss I make by them, yet in their company I shall never be able to add a mite to my celestial treasure. How can I be safe among robbers? They may rob me of a good frame, wound my conscience, and at last leave me with a bleeding heart, which may pain me many days.

3. To grow rich for the world to come, I must study to be heavenly-minded, not by fits and starts, but in one constant, steady, holy frame of spirit. Thus every duty will be my delight; prayer and praise, like my daily food, always pleasant; attendance on the public ordinances like walking in the King's palace garden; reading the Scriptures, like conferring with the dearest friend; and self-examination, like the merchant from a far country, counting over his rich jewels and precious gems, inspecting his gold and silver, that it have the king's stamp, and so be sterling money; that his graces, his duties, his attainments, are approved by scripture and conscience.

4. Holy meditations will mightily augment the spiritual riches. To find God in all things, and at all times, in all places, and in all providences, will enrich my soul for eternity. To find his power in this, his wisdom in that, and his goodness in all, will greatly improve my inquiring, my admiring soul. Meditating much, meditating often, meditating with delight, on him in whom are hid the treasures of wisdom, is a noble way to enrich me for a future world.

5. To be rich in the better country, I must heartily study to approve of all the dispensations of Providence; though not insensible when he frowns, or when he smiles. When the soul of the Christian, with a filial resignation acquiesces in the conduct of his almighty Father, however cross to flesh and blood, and in his unchangeable love, he takes deep root for eternity; while fear and unbelief toss the unstable, like a rolling thing before the whirlwind. It is proper only to children, not to men, to be peevish for toys and trifles; so let the men of this world lament the loss of worldly things but let the heirs of God, the joint-heirs with Christ, rejoice that the treasures of eternity are theirs.

6. To be rich unto God, and for eternity, I must act strong faith on the Rock of ages; for it is from the spoils of battles won by faith, that I amass riches for the invisible world. Faith relying on a reconciled God in all his attributes and perfections, on Jesus in all his offices and relations, on the Holy Ghost in all his graces and operations, must remove mountains of difficulty, pluck up trees of corruption, pull down strong-holds of sin, wrestle against principalities and powers, and be more than conqueror at last, through her all glorious Author and Finisher.

7. I must also redeem time, and improve time; redeem time from this world, and improve it for the world to come. The man of business will be loth to lose a *change hour* for any trifling amusement; and the soul that would be busy for eternity, should look on every hour as his last hour, and should avoid excess of sloth and slumber. Vain amusements, impertinent employments, are cruel moths of time; and time is to be husbanded, though worlds should be squandered away. As the jeweller deals with gold, so must I with time; he is careful about the filings, and loses nothing; so should I about the smallest divisions of time, the hour, the minute, the moment. It never made a dying person's bed thorny, that, by a bad bargain, he lost such and such a sum; but misspent time has made the dying moments of many dismal beyond expression.

8. To be rich in the world to come, I must have an intense love towards God and heavenly things. The men that love the world, pant after the dust of the world, and spare no pains to be rich in the world. A man will never toil himself to gather what he despises; so, unless I prefer heavenly things to earthly, I shall never seek to fill my treasure with invisible excellencies. "He that loveth silver," says the wise man, "shall not be satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance with increase." But he that loveth God, shall be satisfied with God, and entranced with the exuberant fullness of the covenant.

9. To be rich indeed at last, I must endeavor to maintain commmunion with God now. To have fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ, in all his divine fullness, his glorious perfections, and his gracious ways, is the most enriching course that I can carry on below. Every moment of divine intercourse would be sinking another sum in the bank of heaven, so that I should be wonderous rich at last. He that quits the Indies for Europe, sends his treasures before him; then, though he be poor at his departure from the one country, yet he is rich on his arrival at the other; so well were it with me, if I could detach my thoughts and meditations, my care and affections, my joy and delight, my hope and expectation, from this perishing world, and centre them on that which is to come.—*Selected.*

Say Your Prayers in Fair Weather.

So spoke a sea captain to one of his sailors who was much affrighted in a storm. The poor sailor had never been at sea before; and, feeling himself and all the crew to be in eminent danger, he betook himself to prayer. The captain differed from the sailor in this, that at that particular juncture it was necessary for all hands to be at work. The saying of the captain, and circumstances surrounding him, made a deep and lasting impression upon the mind and heart of the sailor. The storm without subsided, but that created within his breast still continued. "Say your prayers in fair weather," was never forgtten by him in his voyage through life. The hurried repetition of the Lord's Prayer was succeeded by repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; and from that time forth the sailor prayed in fair as well as foul weather. He became a soldier of the cross and a preacher of the gospel.

It so happened that on one occasion, whilst he was preaching, the captain entered his church. Immediately the quondam sailor, looking towards him exclaimed, "Say your prayers in fair weather!"—What a delightful and profitable train of thought was thus started, especially when the cause of the exclamation was explained by the preacher to the wondering audience! How suggestive of pious thoughts is that saying! The language of the disciples on the ship, in the Sea of Galilee, in the hinder part of which the Saviour seemed to sleep, was "Save Lord! we perish!" It has been and will be the language of thousands when exposed to dangers, by sea or on land, which threaten immediate death. If an epedimic prevails and hundreds or scores are carried off daily, the people are admonished to pray, and they heed the admonition. This is right, and yet it is proper also to say our prayers in fair weather. We are constantly in danger, and know not what a day or an hour may bring forth. The Saviour, therefore, directs his disciples to "pray always." When engaged in lawful business we may pray for success. The husband and wife may pray for each other always, and so may parents for children, and brothers and sisters for themselves, the household and the neighborhood.

The Pastor should pray always for his flock, and his people should always pray for him.—When we partake of God's bounties we should pray to him to feed our souls with the bread of life. When we clothe ourselves or our little ones, what prayer is so proper as this, that the Lord would clothe them and us with the robe of his righteousness? When we go out, or when we come in, what should prevent our prayers to God, that he would go out and come in with us? We are commanded, in whatsoever we do, to do all to the glory of Him who created us and sustains us. We should be "diligent in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord," then our payers will be heard and our alms, like those of the good Cornelius, will be had in remembrance in the sight of God. Let us not pray only in the storm but in fair weather also. And so let us observe the Saviour's direction, "pray always," in the exercise of a living faith.—*Christian Observer.*

A Fly Leaf to the Rev. Solomon Spittle!

To the Clergy.—*Brethren:*—I am glad to believe, that no order of men is so pure touching the

use of Tobacco. There are those, however, who use it, and thereby cast reproach upon the rest, and seriously impede reform. I wrote to a Boston *millionaire*, soliciting aid in the work among youth, and sent him a book. His reply is instructive and may show perhaps that this satire, as well as other instrumentalities, has a mission to execute in our ranks, and may God speed it in its course.

Yours respectfully,

Fitchburg, 1854. GEO. TRASK.

"*Reverend Sir*:—I have received your little book, UNCLE TOBY ON TOBACCO, and thank you for it. But the best proof of its utility should be its effects upon the clergy. We can hardly expect youth to refrain from Tobacco, when their moral teachers set them so bad an example. When you have reformed those of your own profession, if you will apply to me, I will give you fifty dollars to reform the rest of mankind. Yours very respectfully," &c.

POVERTY OF SPIRIT.—A man must be emptied of himself, in order that he may be filled with the blessing of the gospel. He must become poor in spirit, in order that he may become rich in faith, and a partaker of the Kingdom of Heaven. Blessed, therefore, is the man who thinks meanly of himself, and highly of his Maker and Redeemer.—Blessed is the man who walks humbly with his God, and is also humble towards his fellow creatures. Blessed is the man who both feels and manifests this poverty of spirit. This temper may not exalt him in the eye of the world, but it is the temper befitting his condition—it is a temper honorable to God, and truly beneficial to his fellow-creatures. It is the temper which Christ has pronounced to be characteristic of the Christian. —*Thornton.*

"FALLEN ASLEEP," at Orange, N. J., March 13th, ABRAHAM PERRINE, leaving a wife and seven small children. Bro. PERRINE in early life gave his heart to God and became a most exemplary and active follower of Christ. He united with the Methodist E. Church; and was one of their most active and respected members. The Bible was his delight; and to follow Christ and truth his constant aim. Some six or seven years since he was led to embrace the views of immortality and eternal life *only* through Christ; and that "all the wicked will God destroy," so that sin and misery shall be made to cease. Such views would not then be tolerated in the M. E. Church, and his separation from it was the result; and while that Church—like the ancient "barbarians" at Melita, Acts 28: 4–6,—"looked that he should have swollen, or fallen down dead suddenly," from a contact with what they regarded as a "venomous viper," doctrinally, he stood erect, and so magnified the grace and truth of God as to cause all to "change their minds, and" say—if not, "he is a god," at least—"he lives a Christian life." After long years living outside their church, they bore testimony that he was irreproachable in his Christian character, and they manifested their confidence in him by aiding him and his family in his last protacted sickness—by attending his funeral, and by the Pastor of the Church, ELD. HILLIARD taking part with us in the services of the funeral, which was numerously attended We preached on, "What is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own *soul*"—*psuche, life*—"or what shall a man give in exchange for his *soul*"—*psuche, life?* We spoke about one hour and a quarter; the congregation giving the most fixed and patient attention. We trust our words were not in vain. Spontaneously a collection was made, before our discourse, at the suggestion of a Local Preacher, for the benefit of he widow and her children.

Bro. PERRINE was uniform in his piety—loved home—loved his Bible—loved Christian people—loved to pray in his family and in private. He was fearless in expressing his faith, tho' always done with kindness. So far as we could learn, he was a burning and shining light, which both saints and sinners could see and could not but acknowledge. He *sleeps in Jesus;* and when with Christ, who is *our life*, shall appear *then* will he also appear with him in glory. Col. 3: 4.

BOOKS.—The only works we keep for sale are the following:—

"SIX SERMONS, *Revised and Enlarged.*" Price 63 cents, in plain binding; in *gilt* $1.

"BIBLE VS. TRADITION." Price 75 cts. *bound;* 50 cts. in paper covers.

"DISCUSSION" with Prof. MATTISON. Price 50 cts. bound: 25 in paper covers.

"DOBNEY ABRIDGED"; being the 2d Part of his work on "*Future Punishment.*" Price 37 cts. in paper covers. We will furnish the work entire for 75 cents.

"UNITY OF MAN," or "Review of *Luther Lee* on the Soul." Price 12 cents.

"ANALYTICAL INVESTIGATION *Concerning the Credibility of the Scriptures,*" &c., by DR. MCCULLOH. Price $2.

For particulars, as to these works, see Examiners Nos. 2 and 5, last pages. We keep no *Tracts* of any description except "PROF. PARKS' TEST OF FAITH, by *B. S. Batchelor.*" Of these we have a few. Price $1 per 100, sent free of postage. It is one of the best things published.

CORRECTONS.—In the last EXAMINER, on page 87, right hand column, 18th line from bottom, for "*never*," read *ever*. Page 90, left hand column, 3d line from bottom, for "*acts*," read *sets*: and in same column, 23d line from top, for "*the remission*," read *no* remission. Page 86, right hand column, 28th line from bottom, for "*its*," read *it is*. It is not *our* fault that we are compelled to make these corrections; they were all corrected by us in the *proof*.

THE "MONTHLY RAINBOW" is published by GEO. A. CROFUT, Philadelphia, Pa., "*Devoted to Meteorology, Astronomy, Popular Literature, Inventions and Discoveries, Useful Arts, Printing Interests, Passing Events, Music, Amusements, &c.*" The Meteorological and Astronomical department is edited by DR. L. L. CHAPMAN.

The *Rainbow* has been enlarged to a Folio, containing 32 columns, on good paper, and well executed. Terms 50 cents per year. It bids fair to be a useful and interesting paper on the topics announced.

"ERNEST LINWOOD."—This is a book written "By CAROLINE LEE HENTZ."—It is an attractive exhibition of human life in various conditions, and shows especially the folly of inordinate creature love. Though the scenes are highly wrought, and the *theology* sometimes doubtful, it may prove useful in showing some persons that nothing but a supreme regard to God and His authority can ensure permanent enjoyment. Published by JOHN P. JEWETT & Co., *Boston*. For sale, in this city, by SHELDON, LAMPORT AND BLAKEMAN.

NEW SUBSCRIBERS can still be supplied with the back numbers for *this year*. Let no person calculate that they will be able to obtain the present volume *bound*, at the end of the year, of us. Take care of your papers, as you receive them, if you intend to have a perfect set for 1856.

THE OFFICE OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER is, at our *Residence, No. 62 Hicks Street*, Brooklyn; a short distance from *Fulton Ferry*: but let none forget that our *address* is, "GEO. STORRS, *Editor Bible Examiner, New York*."

Usually we can be found at home at all hours except between nine and eleven o'clock in the morning, when we visit *New York* and call at DR. MCALLISTER'S, 141 Fulton St. where orders may be left for us by persons calling in the city, and not wishing to go to our residence.

THE NEXT EXAMINER will contain Br. H. H. HALL'S second rejoinder, with our response: also, a *Sermon*, by the EDITOR on "*The Soul Saved or Lost.*" If any desire extra copies of it we will print them, if informed in time, at 5 cents per copy.

EGYPTIAN LIGHTHOUSE.—Have you ever read, dear children, about the beautiful lighthouse, built of white marble, that stood many centuries ago at Pharos, in Egypt? It was erected at great expense, and on the summit of the tower, which was several hundred feet above the ground, was a great fire kept burning every night. So as the sailors that passed over the Mediterranean sea, and came near the city of Alexandria, they saw far away in the distance the beacon light, by which to steer their course.

Now the Bible is the same to you as the lighthouse is to the sailor. It is a "lamp unto your feet, and a light unto your path."

How earnestly does the pilot gaze to catch a glimpse, if possible, of the bright beacon light that shall guide him safely over the dark sea.

So should you make the Holy Bible your guiding star, giving heed thereto, "as a light that shineth in a dark place,"

"It sweetly cheers our drooping hearts
In this dark vale of tears;
Bright as a lamp its doctrines shine,
To guide our souls to heaven."

—*Child's Paper.*

CHRISTIAN RESIGNATION.

FROM THE GERMAN OF ULRICH.

Leave all to God,
Forsaken one, and still thy tears,
For the Highest knows thy pain,
Sees thy sufferings and thy fears:
Thou shalt not wait his help in vain;
Leave all to God.

Be still and trust!
For his strokes are strokes of love,
Thou must for thy profit bear;
He thy filial fear would move;
Trust thy Father's loving care;
Be still and trust!

Know, God is near!
Though thou think him far away,
Though his mercy long have slept,
He will come and not delay,
When his child enough hath wept;
For God is near!

O teach him not
When and how to hear thy prayers;
Never doth our God forget:
He the cross who longest bears
Finds his sorrows' bounds are set;
Then teach him not.

If thou love him,
Walking truly in his ways,
Then no trouble, cross, or death,
Shakes thy heart, or quells thy praise:
All things serve thee here beneath,
If thou love God!

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, APRIL 15, 1856. NO. 8.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE SOUL SAVED OR LOST.

A SERMON BY THE EDITOR OF BIBLE EXAMINER.

"For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world" and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"—Math. 16: 26.

This text has been selected as the foundation of discourse by all the professed Ministers of the gospel. And it is one on which as much *fancy* has been expended as almost any other in the Bible.—The reason of this is—It has been assumed that the soul is what it is not; and the context—as usual with many theologians—has been overlooked or disregarded. In this way the true meaning of our Lord, in this grand inquiry, has been neglected and a fanciful construction put upon his words.

Luke, in recording this same discourse, varies the language thus:—"For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose *himself*, or be cast away?" Luke 9: 25. Thus one explains the other; and we see *the soul* is the man *himself*.

It may be proper that we should make a remark here on inspiration. To contend—as some seem to do—that the *words*, recording a transaction or doctrine are all inspired is to bring discredit on revelation itself. We see in the case before us, that Matthew and Luke differ in their *words* in recording the discourse of our Lord; each expressing the sentiments of their Master in their own phraseology, or language peculiar to themselves: but there is a perfect harmony in the *sentiments* recorded, and one helps us to understand the other, and to get the true idea of our Lord. Hence, we say, the inspiration is in the *sentiments* uttered by Jesus, and not in the *words* employed by the Evangelists in making the record.

Two men returned from sea may give an account of a fellow-sailor lost on the voyage: one may say, "he was lost overboard"; the other, "he was drowned." Each expresses the same idea, or truth; but each does so in his own words. So with Matthew and Luke; and their testimony is harmonious by admitting the inspiration is in the sentiments, not in the particular words of the record.

We shall now proceed to an examination of the context in order to arrive at the true meaning of the term *soul*, in the text; and may then apply the subject.

It is important that we look at the occasion and design of which the discourse of the text is a part. Observe then, the Saviour once told his disciples, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." He perfectly understood human nature, and knew that long established prejudices could not be overcome at once; and by communicating too much, that is new and contrary to our previous ideas, persons are often prevented from examining a subject at all; or if the examination has commenced they are liable to be thrown back entirely. When the most cautious and wise method is adoptod in communicating truths that are new and startling, or contrary to previous notions, it will have the effect on many minds of turning them back: they seem unable to advance at all from their old beaten paths. Such was the case with a large portion of our Lord's hearers and disciples at the close of his memorable discourse on *life* only through himself, recorded John 6th; when "many said, This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" and "From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him:" John 6: 60–66. Jesus had, therefore, to carry the apostles forward slowly and with peculiar caution, lest they stumble, fall, and forsake him. At the time our text was uttered, the period of our Saviour's death was drawing near; and it was essential to prepare and fortify the apostles' minds for such a dreadful shock to their expectations. Like the Jews, in general, they supposed "Christ should abide always—*i. e.* remain with them as their *King*. Unless, therefore, their minds were prepared beforehand, their faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Messiah, or *anointed*

King of Israel, would be likely to fail utterly.—To prevent such a catastrophe—as we shall see—our Lord prepared their minds by his heavenly skill.

He understood another principle which too many seem ignorant of, *viz:* that persons *openly committed* to a truth are thereby much better fortified against apostacy than those who, though they may be favorable to the truth, have never openly avowed their regard for it, or *confessed* their faith.

Up to the time of the discourse, from which our text is selected, Jesus had never told his apostles, in so many words, "I am *the Christ*," but left them to learn it from his teaching and works.—Had he announced himself as *the Christ*, in direct terms, it would have been the same thing as to have proclaimed himself *King* of the Jews; and his enemies could have said in truth what they said falsely, *viz:* that he claimed kingly authority, thereby invading Cæsar's rights. This silence on our Lord's part, in not announcing himself *the Christ—the King*—and in charging his disciples to tell no man so, during his life-time, was to avoid giving his enemies the occasion they sought, till his work of teaching was finished. But as he drew near the time of his death, he commences a discourse with the apostles, by drawing out of them a confession—openly made—of their faith in him, and thus preparing them for the sad tidings he was about to communicate of his being put to death.

We now look at the connection of our text.—Jesus had, in the first part of the chapter, warned his disciples to "*beware* of the leaven"—*i. e. doctrine*—"of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." This was important to prepare the way for teaching the truth on the subject of the resurrection which he was about to bring to their minds in his discourse. The Sadducees denied any resurrection of the dead. The Pharisees pretended to hold the resurrection, but it was in fact nothing more than a transmigration of souls. Both of these sects were holders and promulgators of false doctrine; and our Lord warned his disciples to beware of their "doctrine." And "when Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? verse 13. Thus cautiously he approaches them, to draw out their own faith, that they may be openly committed to the truth. The disciples' reply to this inquiry shows what was the doctrine of the Pharisees. "Some say, thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others Jeremiah, or one of the prophets." Such were the surmises of some Jews, Herod, and perhaps others.

The next question goes to test the apostles, whether they were following the popular current of theological teachers, of those days, or whether they dared to be singular, and confess a different faith. "Whom say *ye* that I am?" Now is the time to make an open confession, and thus put up one barrier againt apostacy when future trials arise. Who does not know how much easier it is to draw back on any doctrine where no open acknowledgement has been made in its favor. Some persons always stand in this position of keeping the way open for a retreat when the battle rages too hot for them: "We never professed to believe it," say they, as they carefully hide themselves from the storm; while the thoroughly committed breast the howling tempest, and come out with an increase of confidence in God and in His truth. These have confessed Christ and his words, and he will confess and uphold them; while the others have undertaken to be their own keepers, and hence stumble and fall: they "loved the praise of men more than the praise of God;" "verily, they have their reward."

To the question, "Whom say *ye* that I am?" Peter seems to have answered for all his fellow-apostles; hence it may be regarded as the confession of all: "Thou art *the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" Noble confession: worthy a Christian; an "article of faith" never to be forgotten; and superior to all the human creeds in Christendom; and so Jesus characterised it when he responded, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona"—*son* of Jona—"for flesh and blood"—human teachers, such as Pharisees and Doctors of Divinity—"hath not revealed it unto thee"—did not teach it you—"but my Father which is in heaven"; *i. e.* through the Spirit's teaching by Christ, and the works he performed. By yielding to such testimony, with a willingness to learn, Peter and his fellow-apostles came to the settled conviction that Jesus was the annointed King of Israel—the Son of the living God. "Blessed"—happy—are all who in like manner become settled in this great truth; for if those who *saw* were blessed in their faith, "Blessed are they who having not seen"—as did the disciples—"yet have believed."

Our Lord Jesus now approaches another step towards the announcement of the afflicting truth of his death: and he does so with a skill which shows him to be "the *wisdom* of God." He first assures his disciples that upon "*this rock*"—the truth embraced in Peter's confession, "thou art the

Christ the Son of the living God"; so we understand it—"upon *this* rock will I build my Church"—this grand truth is the corner stone of the Church of Christ: let that fact be ever remembered. Still further to fortify their minds for the awful event of his death, he adds: "and the gates of hell"—*hades*—"shall not prevail against it."

As to the meaning of this expression, it has been explained to signify that all the policy and power of hell should not be able to overthrow his church; the expression being supposed to have reference to an ancient custom of holding courts or councils of war in the porch or court of the city gates, ready to issue forth on their enterprises.—However true such an idea may be, we are sure it is not the idea intended by the Saviour.

There are three Greek words in the New Testament translated *hell*, viz. *Gehenna*, *Hades*, and *Tartarus*. The first is that which applies to the punishment of the wicked; the last to imprisonment; the second, *hades*—is that used by our Lord in this discourse. It occurs eleven times in New Testament Greek, and is ten times translated *hell* and once *grave*—"O *grave*"—*hades*—"where is thy victory?" 1 Cor. 15: 55. The original word signifies *covered* or *hidden:* and properly applies to the *grave*, or the hidden state of the dead. Dr. Bloomfield, in his critical notes on the new testament, edited by Prof. Stuart, late of Andover Theological Seminary, on this text, and on this term in particular, says: "Now certain plausible senses have been propounded: but, besides that they are far-fetched, the constant import of the phrase, both in the Greek Classical, the Old Testament, and Rabbinical writers (where it constantly means *the grave*, or the entrance to it, the state of the dead), must determine it to mean simply *death*."

This statement we regard as mainly accurate; and it harmonizes with the design of Jesus, which was to teach his disciples that though he was about to die, and that they too would die—contrary to their expectations of his course and reign—they need have no fears that death or the grave would prevail against his Church—for he would rise from the dead, and thus secure the resurrection of all his followers—his church—to *life eternal*.—Death should be abolished, so far as it stood in the way of glorifying his church, built "on this rock."

How important was this information, and how well calculated to keep the disciples from final apostacy when their Lord should be put to death, and all their hopes, for a time, blasted. How hath our blessed Lord provided for the trials, and armed his followers against the strongest temptations to let go their faith in him. Happy indeed the man who sits at Jesus' feet and learns of him.

He next informs them that they were to go forward with the work of establishing his truth; and though the language is somewhat figurative, yet it expresses the idea that among the apostles Peter was to act a conspicuous part in establishing that truth; which was the fact. The language, "*bind*" and "*loose*," we apprehend means no more than, *forbid*, or declare *lawful;* and is confined to the *apostles*, and extends to no Successors; for they had none, and never appointed any; and the language itself forbids the idea—"Whatsoever *thou*"; not some one or many coming after "*thee*." No, the authority given to Peter, if it embraced his fellow apostles, embraced no others—no successors—it was not, and in the nature of the case, could not be transferable: all others—from that day to this—pretending to possess such authority are *anti-Christ*, and carry the mark of rebellion against the *head-ship* of Christ in his church.

Our Lord after having said thus much—lest his disciples should now feel at liberty to announce at once the anointed King of Israel, "*charged*" them "that they should tell no man that he was *the Christ*." He himself had never, among the Jews, made such an announcement; and to no others, save to the woman of Samaria; and he had avoided it for the reason we have before suggested, *viz:* that the Jews should not justly accuse him of claiming to be their king; thereby giving them what they would regard a just ground to accuse him to the Roman government, and cause him to be put to death under the appearance of law.

The way is now prepared, and Jesus proceeds with the disagreeable announcement of his death. "From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be *killed*, and raised again the third day."

Terrible tidings to the disciples! How unreconcilable, in their minds for the time being, must such a declaration have been! How had all the previous part of his discourse, for the moment, been obliterated from their minds! How had consternation and amazement taken possession of their heart! The very pall of annihilation seemed to hang over them and all their cherished hopes! No wonder that in the first paroxism of amazemen

"Peter began to rebuke"—*advise*—"him, saying, Be it far from thee Lord: this shall not be unto thee." *Spare thyself, Master*—is the language of poor heart-smitten Peter. He had a lesson now to learn that was bitter indeed. O, what disgrace, reproach, and loss of reputation was like to come upon these disciples, a short time before so hopeful, and full of glorious anticipations of worldly prospects! Must all be laid in the dust so soon? "Spare thyself Lord": little then understanding his own heart and its ambitious desires. Such is often the case with professed followers of Christ. They think it is concern for Christ which makes them act, or give advice to others to act, as they do, when in fact it is quite as much a concern for themselves, or their own reputation, as concern for Christ; yet they may have—as Peter doubtless had—a concern for Jesus also.

Jesus "said to Peter, Get thee behind me Satan: thou art an offence"—an obstacle or stumbling block—"unto me"—one that hinders by wrong counsel, however well intended—"for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men"—human wisdom; which forsakes the path of duty, where God calls them to walk, rather than be exposed to suffering and reproach. Such is the course of unsanctified and unsubdued human nature.

There is an apparent harshness in our Lord's words to Peter, which is the fault of our translation. The term *Satana*—translated *Satan*—primarily imports no more than *adversary*, or an *evil counsellor*. Peter was such in this case.—God's counsel required, for the redemption of men from death, that His Son should be made a perfect Redeemer through suffering and death.—Peter's counsel was to avoid the suffering and death. Thus his counsel was evil, and not in harmony with the purpose of God; though it very much resembled that of many who would think themselves highly reproached if their time serving and popularity seeking was openly rebuked; yet they profess great regard for the cause of Christ. It is a popular Christ—an honored Christ, they are concerned for. A suffering Christ—a reproached Christ, dying in dishonor, is not the object of their love or regard. Alas! how many of these unsanctified Peters there are to be found in Christendom.

Our Lord now proceeds to inform his followers that they have nothing to expect—in his service—from this world but sufferings, reproach, and death. Their worldly schemes of aggrandizement must be abandoned if they intend to be truly his followers—"If any man will come after me let him deny himself"—cease to be seeking selfish and worldly ends, such as ease, sensual gratification, or looking to popular favor, such as only men of the world can expect—"and take up his cross"—whatever reproach and suffering may be the result of strict adherence to Christ and his truth—"and follow me"—wherever Christ may lead; not only through good report, but through evil, also. It is enough for the disciple to be as his Lord. If Christ was despised, and rejected of men—*i. e.* of the Rabbis, and professed religious teachers—for such ever have taken the lead in rejecting the meek and lowly Jesus—let not his followers expect to escape: they too must suffer and be despised; and should not count even upon their lives, which will be in jeopardy by their strict attachment to Jesus and his truth. It is said by some men, that "Man is a *religious* animal." If they had said, "Man is an *irreligious* animal, averse to all moral restraint, and *deifying* himself," they would have been much nearer the truth. Superstition and *selfism* is rife enough in the world, and among men; but it is the natural and implacable enemy of that religion Jesus came to teach and establish; which is a triumph of principle, and the divine life from God, over *animalism*; which latter is sensual, worldly, devilish. Such an antagonism every follower of Christ must encounter; and if he makes up his mind to follow him, at all hazards, he will find our Lord's words not an unmeaning admonition. The natural yearnings of *self* for respect and popular favor, and those animal gratifications which are brutalizing to the mind, need to be laid aside, and their *government* rejected, if we would be followers and imitators of Christ. Yea, *life* itself must be less esteemed than the authority of God and the faith of Jesus. Jesus came into the world to deliver men from death and to confer on them an endless life. But such life can only be bestowed on those whose wills have been demonstrated to be in harmony with the will of God; preferring that above all earthly joys or honors. In order to such a demonstration it must be made to appear—in a state of trial—that the individual counts the will and love of God superior to all other claims which can arise from any associates, or relations of this life; and that he regards Jesus and his truth of more value than all the honors and treasures earth can give. Without such a character eternal life would be a means of sustaining eternal discord under the government of God. With it, eternal life is of more value than any honor, delight, or

possession earth can bestow. He may lose life in the struggle to maintain a supreme regard to the authority and truth of God and His Christ; but, continues Jesus—"Whosoever will *save*"—or, *preserve*—"his *life*"—*psucheen*—"shall lose it." Whoever to avoid shame, reproach, suffering, or death, shall swerve from God, His authority, His Son, or His cause, to preserve his *life* shall fail of life—even that life Jesus came to give. "And whosoever will lose his *life*"—*psucheen*—"for my sake shall find it:" it is not a permanent loss like the other, but only momentary: though lost for Christ, he "shall find it." Blessed assurance: glorious promises. "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in *this world* shall keep it to life eternal." John 11: 25. Such is the sentiment of Jesus.

Now comes the *climax* to the whole discourse: the grand inquiry which binds the whole, stamping the subject with simple, yet awful importance.—We say "simple," because the subject has, really, none of that mystical and fanciful meaning so generally presented. Keeping in mind the whole subject as we have traced it out from the context, and we shall see the sense and true application of the grand inquiry. And what is it? We give it in the true and only honest translation of the term rendered soul—*psucheen*—which is *life*, as in the previous verse; thus: "*For* what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own *life?*"—*psucheen*—"or, what shall a man give in exchange for his *life?*—*psucheen*. The text is an enforcement of the previous discourse; particularly of the preceding verse. *Life*, and not fancied entity called "*the soul*," is the subject of discourse. And honesty requires that *psucheen* should be translated alike in both verses. Either make it *soul* in both, or *life* in both. Try the former, and see if it will make sense; thus: "Whosoever will save his *soul* shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his *soul* for my sake shall find it"! Such a translation shocks common sense and gives the lie to Christianity. Why is the translation of *psucheen* into the term *soul* to be tolerated in our text more than in the preceding verse? Surely no reason can be assigned to satisfy an impartial mind. Even Dr. Adam Clarke admits this, and says—"Sure I am it"—*psucheen*—"means *life* in both verses."

The theory of a soul entity in man, or an immortal something, that "can never die"—as it is affirmed—is what has corrupted this solemn and all important inquiry, and cast darkness and mysticism over the subject, which otherwise would be plain and within the comprehension of every mind: while the common notion has made it a fruitful theme of speculation, superstition, and fanaticism.

Man has, by sin, forfeited *life*—all claims to a living existence. In this state he is visited by God's own Son; sent into the world by the Father's love. That Son testifies of his Father's good will to dying men, and proclaims, in His name, a free and full pardon of past sins if men will repent and receive *life* through the second Adam; who is the *Life-Giver*. To have this life, not only must past sins be repented of and forgiven, but we must develop a character, under the discipline established by Christ, in harmony with his example and in conformity with the will of God. This development will cost us the denial of *self*—perhaps many sufferings; and possibly our life, by the violence of our opposers. He that prefers to preserve or protract this present *life*, rather than endure the trials incident to the necessary development that shall fit him for an eternal residence with God and His Christ, shall *lose life*. But what folly is such a course. How short and fleeting is this life, at best: how soon it will pass away. Why then be guilty of the folly of losing the life Jesus was authorized to promise, and bestow, rather than endure the trials of this life and death, if need be, in order to a preparation for *life eternal?* For, what is a man profited if he could gain the whole world—all its honors, wealth, and pleasures, and protract such enjoyments to the end of a long life, if that life at last become *eternally extinct?* Or what shall a man give in exchange for that life which he "*shall find*" after having lost his life here for the name of Jesus, or in the cause of God, and in seeking conformity to His will? The *life* thus to be found is an *eternal* one; where sorrow, suffering, pain, nor death, are never again to be felt or feared.—Oh, to lose *such a life;* even for the highest and best enjoyments of this world, supposing those enjoyments the most perfect; and protracted to the longest period of human life attainable. What would it profit that man who must sustain this loss? Surely it was not too much to inquire, what comparison there could be between this *whole world gained* and *such a life lost.*

Would you, dying fellow mortal, not meet with such a loss, haste to give your heart to God, through Christ, the "*one Mediator.*" No other being, however wise or good, must come between you and Christ in your approach to God. Beware of leaning on any other arm, or seeking any other Mediator. God has given no other, and he will

accept no other. Be not deceived.—Neither Pope, Bishop, Priest, saint, nor angel can avail here.—Your consecration must be your own *individual* act, through Jesus Christ *alone*. All other trust will fail you, and but mock your hope. To God through Christ you must come or you lose life eternally, and will "be as though you had not been." Obd. 16. *"Why will you die?"*

If sufferings and trials, great and long, await you in your Christian course, and death itself is suffered for the name of Jesus, remember Christ hath said, *hades* shall not prevail against his church. He himself went down into the state of death, or into *hades:* but behold him as he presents himself to John on the isle of Patmos, and hear him exclaim—"I am he that *liveth*, and was dead; and, behold I am *alive* for evermore, Amen; and have the *keys* of *hell*"—*hades*—"and of death." How came he possessed of those *keys?* The devil once "had the power of death"—Heb. 2: 14—but Jesus has it now. How came he in possession of the keys? we ask. The answer is—He volunteered to go down under death and entered hades—"hell"—the hidden state of the dead! But neither death, hell—*hades*—nor the devil could hold him there; for he had never sinned, and hence death could not claim any power over him; so God raised him up from the dead, and he brought up the "*keys*" with him: thus he forever holds the power of death and hades. The man who will not now suffer and die, if need be, for Christ will be eternally *locked* in hades or death: no power in the universe can let such out, for Jesus has the *keys:* and he who follows Christ, and if need be, lays down his life for him, has nothing to fear: hades and death cannot hold him, for Christ holds the *keys*, and has come lawfully in possession of them. Let the world scorn—let persecution rage—let tyrants, civil or ecclesiastical, pour forth all their fury and malice—let them threaten, scourge, torture, and take away the life of Christ's friends, if they will: how vain their rage; they may cry, "We have prevailed over them;" but a voice is heard—*"I have the keys of hell and the grave"—"I am the resurrection and the life":* Rev. 1: 18, and John 11: 25. O, blessed words! glorious assurances! "Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ," will soon be heard bursting from the lips of a glorious company that "loved not their lives unto death," (Rev. 12: 11) because of their love to God and the Lamb. Now they come forth in glory, honor, and immortality; for Jesus held the *keys;* and in the promised hour, *viz: "at the last day,"* he unlocked *hades* and drove back the bars of death, and forth, triumphantly, came rushing, with songs of praise and glory, the once suffering and cross bearing company whom men had despised, dishonored, or slain. But they *live* again, and live for evermore like their glorious Lord and Redeemer—"the *gates* of hades" did not prove strong enough "to prevail" over the Church of Christ.

Glorious day—soul reviving prospect. "Life and immortality" are then possessed and enjoyed. No fear, no sorrow, no pain, no disappointment, tribulation or death, can ever again approach those glorious victors whom Jesus has liberated by *unlocking* their prison house.

But eternal death and night hangs upon all the ungodly, who chose to preserve their lives in *this* world, rather than hazard suffering and death for the name of Jesus. Their prison house is not to be unlocked: no light ever enters there; "THEY *shall never see light,*" (Ps. 49: 19): *they* have *lost* their souls—*their lives.* Alas! what infatuation, what madness were they guilty of! Their short lived pleasures have disappeared forever; and no day star of *hope* ever hangs over their hades—the *keys* thereof are eternally withdrawn.

O, infatuated mortals, what will it advantage you to be successful in your worldly pursuits and pleasures, if so soon death and hades will strip you of all, and no door will ever be unlocked for your escape from your *loss of Eternal Life?* Be wise now; and like Moses, of old, chose "rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season"—a very short time. Like him count "the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of" earth; even though you could secure those treasures in their fulness.

May the mercy and love of God stir you up to a timely consideration and preparation, that you may not be guilty of neglecting that eternal life which is the purchase of Jesus' blood.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive again?

SECOND REJOINDER BY H. H. HALL.

Peru, Ind., March 6th, 1856.

Dear Bro. Storrs:—When I penned my last communication on 1 Cor. 15, I did not then expect to write again on the subject; but some points in your friendly response to my article, seem to call for a reply. I was somewhat surprised that in your answer on 1 Cor. 15, you did not notice but one point in my argument. You give as a reason for not doing so, that my main point is, that the preposition "*in*," verse 22, should be "*by*," and that *if* this is untenable, as *positive*

evidence, *your* remarks Jan. 15th are as likely to be the truth as the view *I* presented. While I think the change of prepositions from *in* to *by* would positively settle the question in my favor, I think the *connection* of verses 21, 22 before noticed, without changing *in* to *by*, also settles the question. And the arguments I presented, especially in reference to the *marked distinction* shown between "*the dead*" of verses 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, and "*the dead*" of verse 42, by the connection in each case, (which you only notice by saying, you are utterly unable to the see the distiction that I do,) strongly confirms my position. But letting this pass, I now proceed to notice your reply on the preposition "*by*" in verse 21, 22 as translated by Prof. Murdock.

(1.) You think "if the translation had been *contrary* to the Prof.'s theory," you "should not doubt its accuracy; but as it is contrary to Paul's language in the English translation, and contrary to the Greek also," you "are not at all convinced by Prof. M.'s translation; especially when it is most manifest he has in other instances translated under the influence of the popular theory." Hence you say, "We venture the assertion that in the Syriac original the same preposition is used in verse 22 that is used in verse 18, and that it is '*in* Christ' in both verses; and until Br. H. can show it is not, Prof. M.'s translation is not entitled to the least weight in this discussion." I cannot think with my brother that Prof. M. by changing *in* to *by*, has been influenced by the popular theory, or has resorted to this change in order to escape the conclusion of universal salvation as supposed by Universalists to be taught in verse 22; for if he was *here* under the influence of the popular theory, why was he not, in translating the original of the words *save, saved, Saviour, salvation*, as they occur in the common version, by the words *life*, vivifier, life-giver, &c., as shown in your discourse entitled "Christ the Life-Giver, or the Faith of the Gospel," and founded on his version from the Syriac? Certainly the Prof. has given a faithful translation as you have shown, and it is in favor of our view on the immortality question, and against the popular theory.

I now propose to show, not knowing what the preposition is in the Syriac, that Prof. M. in changing *in* to *by*, has not only *not* done any violence to the meaning of the Apostle as expressed in the common version, but has truthfully expressed his *real* meaning by the change.

(2.) It is true as you say that the *Greek* preposition in verse 21, is *dia–by*, and in verse 22, *en–in*; hence you say, "Now if Paul meant *by*, in this last (22d) verse, why did he change the preposition? why not have used *dia* as in the previous verse? why change to the same preposition he had used in the 18th verse—fallen asleep *in–en* Christ?" I reply, I will ask my brother, why Paul changed the preposition from *en–in* and *by* to *dia–by* in 2 Cor. 6: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, when by an examination we see he *meant* the *same* thing by the different prepositions in each verse? I will refer to Paul's language that the reader may readily see the force of *my* question, and the answer to *yours*. He says, verse 4, "But in all things approving ourselves as ministers of God, *en–in* much patience, *en–in* afflictions, *en–in* necessities, *en–in* distresses. 5. *In* stripes, *in* imprisonments, *in* tumults, *in* labors, *in* watchings, *in* fastings. 6. "*By–en* pureness, *en–by* knowledge, *en–by* long suffering, *en–by* kindness, *en–by* the Holy Ghost, *en–by* love unfeigned. 7. *By* the word of truth, *en–by* the power of God, *en–by* the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left. 8. *By–dia* honor and dishonor, *by–dia* evil report and good report."

Here you see the Greek *en* occurs in verses 4, 5, 6, 7, and is translated by *in*, in verses 4, 5, and with *by* in verses 6, 7: in the 8th verse Paul changes the preposition to *dia–by*, when the connection and meaning are precisely the same. Now, my dear brother, if you can account for the change of the preposition here, it will be as easy for me to account for the change of the same in 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22. I will however say that these changes are not unfrequent in the Bible, and are easily accounted for, as we see by the language of the Apostle just quoted, upon the principle that the construction and connection of a sentence in which a preposition occurs, *points* out its meaning. We shall see this more readily by noticing the definition of the preposition *en*–in, some of which are as follows—*within, among, at, by, near to, in the presence of, before*, &c. Webster says, "*In* signifies *by*, or *through*; as, *In* thee shall all nations be blessed; I am glorified *in* them." And he might well have added—"*In* Christ shall all be made alive." The meaning of "*in*," in these three phrases is precisely alike: but the meaning of the same preposition in the expression "fallen asleep *in* Christ"—"the dead *in* Christ"—is very different, for you cannot substitute *by* or *through* in either case, as in the others, and make *truth* or sense. Again the fact that *en* is translated 122 times in the N. T. by the particle *by*, and a great many times by the preposition *through*, ought to settle the question. For the benefit of the reader, I will give a few examples to show that *en* does mean, in certain constructions and connections, the same as *by* and *through*; and the sentences will be similar to the one in dispute. "If I *by* Beelzebub cast out devils, *by* whom do your children cast them out? —swear not at all, neither *by* heaven—nor *by* the earth—*by* what authority doest thou these things? —*by* what *means* he is made whole—*by* the name of Jesus Christ—*by* the coming of Titus, &c.—*through* mighty signs and wonders, *by* the power of the Spirit of God—sanctify them *through* thy truth—have life *through* his name—*through* sanctification—*through* grace—*through* the blood of the everlasting covenant—*through* the knowledge of God," &c. This is sufficient to show that the preposition *en* means *by* and *through*, or, *by means of*—on account of, &c. in scores of instances: it also proves conclusively that *en*–in, in verse 22 has the *same meaning* that *dia–by* has in verse 21, and that it has *not* the same meaning that the same preposition has in verse 18, to which you refer. Consequently it follows that Prof. Murdock *did* give a correct translation of verse 22 by the use of *by* instead of *in*. If this be true, then it necessarily settles the question at issue on this

chapter, and also proves that there *will* "be a resurrection both of the *just* and the *unjust*."

I now wish again to quote in brackets, verses 21, 22, &c., according to the common version and in the light of the above argument. "For since *dia*–by" [*through* or *by means* of] "man" [Adam] "came death" [to all] "*by*" [or through] "man" [Christ] "came also the resurrection of" [all] "the dead." "For as *en–in*" [*by* or *through*] "Adam ALL" [righteous and wicked] "die, even so *en*–in" [*by* or *through*] "Christ shall" [the same] "ALL" [righteous and wicked] "be made alive.—But EVERY *man*" [does this mean *every man*, or *only* every *saint?* that shall be made alive] "*in* his own order" [or *under* his own banner] "Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end," [when the wicked will be made alive.]

You again say, "But if we were to admit that the preposition *en*–in—might properly be rendered *by*—which we do not in *this* case"—[have I not, my brother, shown conclusively by numerous examples and comparisons that it *is* properly rendered *by?*]—"still nothing would be gained," you say, "to the idea of its embracing any out of Christ; for none die *by* Adam except by a *union* with him, as his *children; 'even so'* there must be a *union* with Christ, as *his* children, in order to be made alive *by* Christ." This argument looks very plausible, but pardon me when I say, I do not think it logical, from the premises as I have shown in the above paraphrase, and will now endeavor further to show. It does seem to me you place too much tress on the expression "*even so*"—more than the connection will warrant—nay, the connection absolutely *forbids* such stress,—reasoning as you do, from the "*union* with Adam as his *children*" to the "*union* with Christ, as *his* children." I am convinced of this by examining the same expression in other places,—for instance, Math. 7 : 17—"Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? *Even so* every good tree bringeth forth good fruit." Now what is the *force* of this expression here? It is simply this,—as men do not expect to gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles, *so by the same law*, they *do* expect all *good* trees to bring forth *good* fruit, and *corrupt* trees to bring forth *evil* fruit. The original of these words is also rendered, "*so in like manner*"—Mark 13 : 29.

(3.) Now with the above ideas in the mind, let us see if the following is not really the meaning of the Apostle:—"*for as through*, or *by means* of Adam's TRANSGRESSION *all* men die, even so *through* or *by means* of Christ's RESURRECTION shall all men be made *alive:* but every man shall be made alive under his own banner." Can you not see from *this* that the "*even so*," has no reference to the *union* existing between Adam and *his* children, and the *union* between Christ and *his* children?—but that it *does* have reference to the TRANSGRESSION of Adam which brings *death* to *all*, and to the RESURRECTION of Christ which brings *life* to *all?*—not ETERNAL *life* to all, but simply *life* from the dead—"*made alive.*" Thus you see, my dear brother, that a *resurrection* to *life*, does not depend upon a *union* with Christ, but upon the RESURRECTION of Christ, for *his* resurrection and the "resurrection of *the dead*" is the great theme of the Apostle in this chapter. Hence I think my brother's position is untenable, and his argument "far fetched" and unnatural, overlooking as he does the connection (of verses 21, 22), which gives the order of resurrection of all the dead, beginning at Christ and ending with the wicked.

But I must pass to notice briefly two or three other points.

(4.) You say, "As to Adam the first," you "long ago became satisfied, that whatever might be true as to the resurrection of his *posterity*, his resurrection was an impossibility. A personal sinner, under positive law, with a definite penalty—'thou shalt surely die'—which penalty admitted of no revocation," &c. Now I would ask my brother, if every man is not a *personal* sinner—under positive law, with a definite penalty—"the soul that sinneth it shall die"? If so, then on your hypothesis, I do not see how *any* man can have a resurrection. But you say the penalty of the Adamic law admitted of no revocation: if that penalty was simply *death*—extinction of *life*, as we both believe, then the same penalty still holds good against the *posterity* of Adam: I ask *how* then, if your argument be good, can *any* man be raised from the dead? Paul gives the only answer, in my opinion, that can be given, and this applies to all men—not even excepting Adam—it is this—"For as *by* Adam all die, even so *by* Christ" [through his *resurrection* and by his power] "shall ALL be made alive." You further say, "Besides, no hope of his *personal* deliverance was held out to him—but on the contrary he was told by his Judge, distinctly, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Why was there not as much hope of personal deliverance in *his* case as in the case of his *posterity?* Is there any proof that the promise, "the seed of the woman" should bruise the serpent's head, (Gen. 3 : 15,) does not apply to Adam as well as to his children? The fact that he was *of* the dust and unto dust should return, does not prove it, for his posterity are *of* the dust and also return to dust again.

(5.) You do not know, you say, what I mean by the following—Suppose there is no revival principle *in* the *wicked dead;* is there any abstractly, *in* the *righteous dead?* I thought I had made myself understood, but it seems not altogether, therefore I will explain. By *abstractly* I mean simply disconnection from Christian character; or in other words, I mean to say that when a Christian is dead and resolved to dust, there is no more revival principle *in* him or *in* his dust than there is *in* a sinner who is in like condition as to his physical frame, for neither are like a grain of wheat that sprouts gradually and comes forth slowly because of the living germ within, but it is as I said before, *at* the voice and *by* the power of the Son of God that ALL who are in their graves come forth; "they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life [*eternal*] and they that have done evil unto the RESURRECTION of damnation." The Spirit of God that dwells in the Christian, and by which he comes forth to the resurrection of eternal life, does *not* refer to an indwelling of the Spirit

while in a state of *death*, as you seem to intimate by your remarks, but while in *life*—"For if the Spirit of Him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, [while you live] He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that *dwelleth* in you."—And by this the Apostle does not mean that the *wicked dead* will *not* come forth to the resurrection of condemnation as taught by Christ, but simply that they (Christians) will thus be made alive to live forever as taught elsewhere.

(6.) Your reply to my remarks on the words of Christ—"Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the *just*," is no more satisfactory to me than those on the other points already noticed. Do you not, my brother, misapprehend the import of the language of the Evangelist? when he says, "And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean." You think from this that the disciples "had no knowledge of the true idea of a resurrection from the dead"—that they "were ignorant of any resurrection prior to Christ's resurrection," but that "our Lord taught them there should be a resurrection of the *just*, and that then he would reward them." Therefore you "see no ground to infer from this text a *second resurrection*." Now it is very evident to me that the point of questioning with the disciples in regard to what the rising of the dead should mean, did not refer to the *nature* of the resurrection of the dead, as you think, but to the fact of Christ's *death*, which as yet they did not understand was to take place for the sins of the world; consequently they did not know what the rising from the dead of the Son of man meant. If I am correct here, the text still stands good as proof of a second resurrection.

My brother's view of the "*second death*" having been fully met, as I think, by Bro. Grew, I shall not take the time and space to notice it at present.

(7.) I however wish to refer to your remarks in reply to my quotation of Isa. 24: 21, 22. You think the text would have no weight in the question, but for the words I inserted in brackets as follows,—"And they [the wicked] shall be gathered together [in the dust] as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison," [house of death, *sheol*] "and after many days shall they be visited [by the voice and power of the Son of God, and shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation. "By putting *sheol* in brackets, after 'shut up in prison' as if that was the original word for prison," you say "Some might suppose it is a text in point, but the original word here is *masgair—a 'lock-up place.'*" I knew what word was used, for I looked before penning the text, but I did not suppose any one would think I intended to leave the impression that *sheol* was the word used for prison, as I did not put it *after* prison, as I should have done had it been the word used. I only intended to express my opinion that "*the prison*" was an allusion to *sheol*, or the state of the wicked in death: and I still think so; if it is not, I must confess I am unable to imagine what it can refer to. Will my brother inform me? But you add,—"Now we think the text has no reference whatever to the resurrection of the dead to life. Besides, the prophet saith in the 26th chapter, of these 'lords'—'*high ones*'—who 'had dominion over us' * * * '*they* are dead, *they shall not live;* they are deceased, *they* shall not rise': &c. Compare Isa. 26: 14, and 19; and when Br. H. will give us as clear and positive evidence that the wicked dead shall live again, as is here presented that '*they shall not live*' again, then we may feel our *doubts* removed," &c. It is singular that my brother considers this quotation as a strong, not to say a *positive* proof text against the resurrection of the wicked. I consider it a pointed proof text in favor of the *destruction* of the wicked *at the day of judgment*. It is very clear to my mind that the Prophet is here carried in prophetic vision, (as in Isa. 55.) down through the vista of the future to the judgment—he beholds "the great white throne, and him that sits thereon, from whose face the earth and the heaven flee away and there is no place found for them." And he beholds "the *dead*" [those who had died] "small and great, stand before God; and the books are opened: and another book is opened which is the book of life: and the dead [righteous and wicked] are judged out of those things written in the books according to their works. And the sea gives up the dead which are in it; and death and *hades* deliver up the dead which are in them": [this looks like a *resurrection* of the *just* and the *unjust*, for *none* are excepted] "and they are judged *every man* according to their works. And death and *hades*" [which held the dead] are "cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death" [or destruction of death and *hades*.] And whosoever is not found written in the book of life is cast into the lake of fire" [where they die the second death.] The man of God seeing all this with his prophetic ken, exclaims in the language my brother has in part quoted,—"They are dead, they shall not live" [again] "they are deceased, they shall not rise" [again]: "therefore hast thou VISITED" [by a *resurrection*—as they were to be '*visited after many days*' (years) Isa. 24: 22,] "and DESTROYED—*shomad—annihilated* them, and made all their memory to perish."

That I am right in my view of your '*positive*' proof text, and consequently on the main point at issue, is evident to my mind from two facts; first, that according to your position the sinners are destroyed, or, rather *die* one at a time, while the Bible declares—yea the Prophet Isaiah declares that they shall be *destroyed* TOGETHER.—Isa. 1: 28, "And the *destruction* of the trangressors and of the sinners shall be TOGETHER; and they that forsake the Lord shall be *consumed*." Does not *your* view of Isa. 26: 14, involve the Prophet in a contradiction? I cannot see it otherwise. Ps. 37: 38, "But the transgressors shall be destroyed TOGETHER." Job. 21: 30, "And do ye not know their tokens, that the wicked is RESERVED to *the day* of DESTRUCTION? they shall be *brought forth*" [*how*, my brother, if not by a *resurrection?*] "to *the day* of wrath." 2 Peter 2: 9, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to RESERVE the *unjust* unto the *day of*

judgment to be punished." Why *reserve* them to the day of destruction—to the day of judgment to be punished, if when they die that is the end of them? what kind of *reservation* is this?—how do you account for such pointed language? if they are to be *reserved* and then never "*brought forth to the day of wrath to be punished.*" Are not *these* the passages we rely upon to prove that "God hath appointed a day in which to judge the world," and that he does not judge men, nor *reward*, nor *punish* them *when* they die?

The second fact is this;—on your hypothesis, the sinner is NOT *punished* according to the representations of the Bible, as the penalty of the Adamic law *only*, is executed against them; and *this* penalty is also executed against the righteous, the only difference being that *death* holds *perpetual* dominion over the former, and only *temporary* dominion over the latter. If then this is *the* punishment of the sinner, it *cannot* be true, as the Bible declares, that "the transgressors shall be destroyed TOGETHER"—they will NOT be *burned* in the *fire*—they will *not* be *as* the burnings of lime---they will *not* be *consumed*—they will *not* be cast into a *furnace of fire* where there is *weeping* and *gnashing of teeth*—they will *not* be *devoured* AS *stubble fully dry*—they will *not* be *burned up with unquenchable fire*—fire will *not* come down from God out of heaven and devour---annihilate them—they will only die and be buried!---they will *not* be burned up *root* and *branch*---they will not be *ashes* under the feet of the righteous---they will *not* be cast into the fires of GEHENNA---NO---NO—they must forever remain in *sheol*---*hades*---they will never appear before the judgment seat of Christ to "give an account for every idle word" spoken---it is *not* true that when "He cometh with clouds" that "every eye shall see him and they also who *pierced* him" [on the cross] "and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." My brother, what is the meaning of the *startling*, *thrilling* sentences above quoted? Does God trifle with the children of men? no, you do not believe it. Has he then said that ALL shall appear before the judgment seat of Christ, and will he not bring them there? Has he said that sinners shall be destroyed *together*, and will it not be done? Has Christ said the wicked shall be cast into GEHENNA, where they are to be "*burned up with unquenchable fire*," and *will* they remain in *hades* and not be burned up---not be consumed---not be destroyed? It cannot be possible that God would *even* in a *figurative* sense employ such burning words---such moving language---such tremendous sentences against the wicked, and in reference to their punishment, if he only intended to *let them die* and go to nothing, and there remain forever. No, no, my dear brother, it is unreasonable, inconsistent, unscriptural, and therefore impossible.

I again submit my arguments to the careful and candid perusal of the reader, with the fervent prayer that we may all be led into the truth.

Yours in hope of eternal life,

H. H. HALL.

Response to H. H. Hall's Second Rejoinder.

We have numbered the sections of Br. Hall's Rejoinder, to avoid repetition, and that the reader may turn back to his remarks, and then looking at the corresponding figures in our response see the bearings of the subject. The numbers we have placed in Br. H.'s article are enclosed in *parenthesis*, and each corresponding figure in our reply is accompanied with quotation marks. We call the parts numbered "*sections*," because they sometimes embrace several paragraphs of his article.

"(1.)" Prof. MURDOCK translated the terms, *save*, *Saviour*, &c., *life*, *Life Giver*, &c., probably without a suspicion that the translation would give any help to such views as Br. H. and ourself entertain on the immortality question. The only *life* he had in his mind was that of *spiritual* life. He had no knowledge till *after* he had completed his translation—if we are correctly informed—that it would be used in the sense we employ. Hence there is no parallel between this case and that of 1 Cor. 15: 22, where he did know what use Universalists made of the text.

Is it Br. Hall's opinion that the Prof. was not influenced by the popular theory in translating Math. 25: 46? There he changes the term "punishment" to "*torment.*" Will Br. H. allow that the *Greek* term, "*kolasin*," used in that text, can be thus translated, unless under the influence of the popular theory? The *Syriac* Testament was originally from the Greek. If the Prof. was thus influenced on Math. 25: 46, is it not quite likely that he changed *in* to *by* in 1 Cor. 15: 22 for the same reason, *viz.* to wrest it from the hands of Universalists? We think so, and are still of opinion that the change is of no authority or weight in this discussion.

"(2.)" To sum up all in few words, on Br. H.'s array of prepositions, we answer, it is not, *in fact*, whether the preposition would make sense by giving it a different translation, but would that different translation give the *undoubted meaning of the author?* If it does not, it is not to be received as *authority*, or as settling any question.

In 2 Cor. 6: 4-8 it is a perfect matter of indifference whether the preposition were translated *in* or *by*, in verses 6 and 7: the real sense would be the same in either case, as *in* would have expressed the idea of the apostle. And so in the 8th verse, *dia* might have been rendered *in*, though that is not its first sense. The reason, therefore, why the apostle "changes the preposition," in the 8th verse, and uses *dia*, is, first, because it was a matter of perfect *indifference* which preposition was used, the sense being unchanged which ever was used; and secondly, it was perfectly natural to change to *dia*—after having used *en* nineteen times in the four previous verses—to avoid further repetition. These two considerations are a sufficient answer to Br. H. on that point. Neither of these considerations are applicable to 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22.

In the first place, it was not a matter of indifference which preposition was used in verse 22, as the sense is materially altered in that verse, in Br. H.'s opinion, if *by* is the true rendering. It is then very important that Paul should not

change *dia* for *en* in passing from verse 21 to 22, if he intended to convey the same idea in each verse. Besides, there had been no such repeated use of *dia* as to make it desirable to change the preposition to avoid sameness.

We are decidedly of opinion "that the construction and connection" of this whole chapter "*points* out" the "meaning" of *en*, in verse 22, to be *in:* and that it is "*in Christ*," and not *by* Christ merely. The work of making *alive* from the dead is specially the work of the *Spirit* of God. "If the *Spirit* of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall *also* quicken your mortal bodies *by His Spirit* that dwelleth in you." Rom. 8 : 11. But that Spirit dwelleth *only* in those who are *in* Christ; or who are members of his mystical body—the true church. Christ is their "resurrection and life" by virtue of the Spirit of God which was given him *without* "measure"; they being his body. To suppose that the same apostle should teach the *Romans* that their revival into life depended on the indwelling of the Spirit of God—that raised up Christ—and then tell the *Corinthians* that all men indiscriminately, should be made alive *by* Christ, is to suppose that he was not a very guarded teacher, to say nothing of his inspiration. We cannot credit any such construction of Paul's words. He declares that his preaching "was not *yea* and *nay*;" 2 Cor. 1 : 19. Contrasting Rom. 8 : 11 with 1 Cor. 15 : 22, and allowing *by* to be the apostle's true meaning in the last text, to our mind it would be as clear a case of "yea and nay" as can well be conceived of. "*If* this be true." No, Br. H. we are satisfied it is *not true*. In our mind, on this text, there is no "*if*" about it; and no "brackets" can make an impression on us of the truthfulness of changing *in* to *by* in the text. Br. H. has not "shown conclusively by numerous examples and comparisons" that *en*, 1 Cor. 15 : 22, "*is* properly rendered *by*" in "*this case*."

As to Br. H's remarks on the term "*even so*," we can afford to let him have the idea that it means "*so in like manner*," and then the argument we presented before is untouched, till such time as *by* is established as the true sense of the apostle.

"(3.)" This section of Br. H.'s remarks may be conclusive in his own mind, but he fails to make us "see" that he has made out any thing but universal salvation; though he has put in a protest that notwithstanding "the resurrection of Christ brings *life* to all" it is "not *eternal* life to all, but simply *life* from the dead." To use his own language, *we* "think" our "brother's position is untenable, and his arguments 'far-fetched' and unnatural," confounding the "curse of the law" with the "gospel of Christ"; for he admitted in his article March 1st, p. 65, if Christ had not been raised "there could be no resurrection of *the dead* —righteous or wicked." Hence, if Christ had not come up from the dead, the wicked dead would never have been revived into life. But now Christ is manifested to be the greatest curse to the wicked dead: or else, if he makes them all *alive* from the dead, he will secure their eternal life; or at least give them another and better chance to secure it themselves than they had before. Is the greatest curse to the wicked the fact that Christ has risen from the dead? thereby securing their revival into life, to be tormented and killed again, regardless of all their anguish, horror, and despair? Is that indeed a gospel *benefit?* If so, the gospel is more terrible and horrible than the law, which when a sinner was dead let him alone to remain in eternal night, as Br. H. admitted in his previous article.

The fact is, the gospel comes with blessings, and blessings *only*. It is a proclamation of good news of glad tidings; the glad tidings that dying men might have life." "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish"—as all were perishing in the sense of going out of life, out of being—"but have everlasting life." It comes with no such kind of "good news" as that of a temporary and horrible life from the dead to be tortured without mercy, till some fancy "law is satisfied." No, no, brother, we have looked so long through the spectacles of unmitigated and endless torments that it hurts our eyes to look at God as the gospel reveals Him: we must have a half-way house, in which we can still show sinners that they are to be horribly and hopelessly tormented "beyond the grave." "*The wages of sin is death*," cries inspiration. "That's nothing," cries superstition and tradition; "the sinner must be made alive and tormented awhile," or "eternally." "For what purpose or end?" cries reason: and echo answers, "*For what?*" To this inquiry revelation is silent. No voice of explanation comes up from that fountain of light to such a thrilling inquiry; and for the most obvious reason; *revelation* recognizes no such state of torment "beyond the grave." It comes to dying men with the proclamation of "*Life*"—"*Eternal Life*"; and this "*in* God's Son." It makes no proclamation of a "*temporary life* beyond the grave"; but, it does complain of dying men, "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." It makes the condition of living again to be faith in Christ—union with Christ; and states distinctly, "If any man be *in* Christ he is a *new creature*": such and such *only*, are to be *born* from the dead; and that, *by* the Spirit of God—"*neither can they die any more*." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall *not see life;* but the wrath of God *abideth on him*." Such fell under the *curse* of the law by refusing to come to Christ that they "might have life"; and the consequence is, the wrath of God abideth on them, and *they* "shall not see life."

The Scriptures speak of no rising from the dead into life but that which is the subject of "*hope*." It was for "*the hope* of the resurrection of the dead" that Paul was "called in question," or judged; Acts 23 : 6; and this hope is "through the power of the Holy Spirit"; Rom 15 : 13; and 8 : 11, 23–27. And the apostle prays for the *saints*, that "The eyes of your understanding may be enlightened; that ye may know what is *the hope* of His calling, and what the riches of the glory

of His inheritance *in the saints*, and what is the exceeding greatness of *His power* to usward who *believe*, according to the working of *His mighty power*, which He wrought in Christ, when He *raised him from the dead*," &c. Eph. 1 : 18–20. The resurrection *by* the Spirit of God, into life from the dead, is *the great and peculiar blessing* of the gospel; and is *the hope* of the gospel. Those *out* of Christ, and living in sin, are "without God" —consequently have not *His Spirit*—"having *no hope*"; hence will not be partakers in that which is the object of hope, *viz:* "the resurrection of the dead." See Eph. 2 : 12. They were "*without Christ*"; hence, "*in their sins*;" and Paul clearly states that such a condition makes it certain that they will have no resurrection, or revival into *life*; but that they are *perished*, when dead. Such, to our mind, is clearly the force of his language 1 Cor. 15 : 17, 18, and he immediately adds, "If in this life only *we* have *hope in* Christ, *we* are of all men most miserable; thus distinguishing between those who have *the hope* of the gospel and those who have not!

When our translators have used the phrase "*in* Christ"—which they have done near forty times in the New Testament—there is scarce an instance in which violence would not be done and confusion introduced by substituting the preposition *by* for *in*; and 1 Cor. 15 : 22, is not an exception; nor can it be made one, unless *positive testimony* of the living again of the wicked dead can be found in other portions of inspiration; which, as yet, has not been done to our mind.

"(4.)" We regret that Br. H. can see no difference between the case of Adam and his posterity. Are Adam's posterity—during their trial, or probation—under the *same law* that Adam was? Had the law given to Adam a *Mediator*? Had it an atoning Priest? Had the *old* covenant with Adam a *promise* of life, if he committed *one* act of disobedience? Was there any hint that he might be forgiven that one act, if he committed it? Was he informed there might be *hope* in his case if he sinned? Was he told that if he sinned he had "an *Advocate* with the Father"? Was not Adam's *one* sin to decide his fate?

We might multiply these questions; but these are abundant to show that whatever is the character of the law Adam's posterity are under, it is not the *Adamic* law, as a ground of justification. It is just the reverse of all the particulars involved in our suggestive inquiries. Adam's posterity were "made subject to vanity"—or *death*—"not willingly"—or, by a voluntary act of their own, as Adam's was—"but by reason of Him who subjected the same *in hope*," of a resurrection; which they might attain through the Mediator of the new and "better covenant." Here forgivenness, or "remission of sins" is *proclaimed and promised* to the penitent and believing sinner. The law we are under, the wages of which is death, is now in the hands of a *Mediator*; hence we may be, if we will, under the law to Christ," by believing in him; so that the *penalty* can be remitted.

The penalty of the Adamic law went forth without a Mediator, and cannot be revoked, we repeat it,—in Adam's case— so far as we can see, unless *deception* was practiced by the Lawgiver. Adam's posterity who reject the "one Mediator" of their dispensation, die without remission—"*die in their sins*"—"for if ye believe not that I am he, *ye shall* die in your sins," John 8 : 24, and "whither I go *ye cannot come*," verse 21. The same penalty is visited on them that was on the first Adam: They die "without hope," and are "held with the cords of their sins," Prov. 5 : 22; and "shall *remain* in the congregation of the dead," Prov. 21 : 16; "they shall never see light" * * * are "like the beasts that perish," Psa. 49 : 20, 21; "the wrath of God *abideth* on them" * * * they shall not see life," John 3 : 36: they have no part *in* him nor *with* him who is "the resurrection and the life": they by their own choice, are inseparably joined to the *animal* Adam, who was "of the earth earthy," and ended in the "*dust*"; so do they, and never feel the quickening power of the *spiritual* Adam, because they never were joined unto that living stream—they had no living union with the living Christ, the second Adam. But the Adamic penalty never is executed on any member of Christ's body. That penalty was not "simply extinction of *life*"; it was extinction *without hope*—without revival into life. "Paul" does "give us the only answer that can be given" how "any man can be raised from the dead": and it is distinctly and clearly by being *in* Christ and in no other way. An unbroken union with the first Adam is followed by an unbroken death. A living union with the second Adam is stronger than death, and "thanks be to God which giveth us the victory *through*—"*dia*—"our Lord Jesus Christ"; 1 Cor. 15 : 57. But those who go down under *the law* of death—as they do who die "in their sins"—death holds it victory by the "strength" of the law.

In Adam's case there was no hope of deliverance, because no such promise was made to him. The promise, if it be a "*promise*," that the seed of the woman "shall bruise" the serpent's head was not made to Adam at all: *personally* he had no part in it; and the Scriptures never give a hint in that direction; but the dark cloud of an eternal night hangs over him. When Br. H. will *prove* that the *animal* sinner, Adam, was embraced in any promise of *life* made to the race, we will pledge ourself to prove universal immortality, and restorationism. If God's word is not to be credited when unconditionally, and without reservation, it threatened Adam that he should "*surely die*," if he sinned, then the threatening is just as likely to fail of a final execution in the case of any other and of all other transgressors: for God no more unconditionally said "the soul that sinneth it shall die," than He said to Adam, "thou shalt surely die"; and it is just as likely to be reversed in the former case as in the latter; but we are satisfied "it cannot be reversed in either. In the sense in which Adam was to die, and in which impenitent sinners die, no member of Christ's body—the true church —ever did die, or ever will. "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and *are dead*. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven that

a man may eat thereof and *not die*"; John 6: 49, 50. "God is not a God of *the dead*";—such as those who died in the wilderness,—therefore *they* "shall *not see life*"; but he is the God of such as "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob"; and *all* such "live unto Him": they are not dead under the *penalty* of law, but were made subject to death only in the sense of being *asleep in Jesus* to wake again; for, "because I *live*, ye shall live also," saith Jesus to his followers, John 14: 19. Jesus is *their life*. Is he also *the life* of the wicked? Nay, verily; they "have *no* life in" them, because not united to Christ, the only medium of a resurrection life that God has ever revealed. Dying in their sins—out of Christ—under the curse of the law—a revival into life is impossible. Thus it appears to our mind.

"(5.)" This section we are willing to let pass by simply saying, that *Christians* "sleep *in* Jesus," and are never to be regarded as separated from the Spirit of God, in him, "whether we wake or sleep"; for "Christ died for us that whether we wake or sleep we should *live together* with him"; 1 Thess. 5: 10. "If ye live after the flesh ye *shall die*: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye *shall live*"; Rom. 8: 13. No, the Spirit of God is not pledged to give even a "temporary life" to those who live after the flesh. If that Spirit gives life to the dead at all, "at the last day," we have yet to learn that that life is not *eternal*.

"(6.)" We are perfectly willing our brother should have his own opinion as to what the disciples meant when they questioned "what the rising from the dead should mean"; though our mind is unchanged, that it related not to the resurrection of the Son of God only, but to the resurrection in general. It was a subject on which neither they nor the Jews in general had any definite knowledge; the Sadducees denying it altogether, and the Pharisees making it a transmigration of souls.

"(7.)" Br. Hall may think the Prophet Isa. 24: 21, 22, is carried down to see "the great white throne," &c. Rev. 20; and if that was not what is meant he may not be "able to imagine what it can refer to"; but we must say, to us, his application looks very much like the work of *imagination*; and his endeavor to make Isa. 26: 14—"they are dead, they *shall not live*—they are deceased they shall *not rise*," &c.—apply *after* both the righteous and wicked have been made alive from the dead, as he supposes, may satisfy his mind; but to our mind it is *utterly irreconcilable* with the prophet's testimony; for he makes revival into life of the Lord's people to be *after* these "lords" and "high ones" are dead to live no more. Look at the prophet's language Isa. 26: 14: "*Thy are dead, they shall not live*; they are deceased *they shall not rise*: * * * thou hast visited and *annihilated* them," &c. Verse 19, "*Thy* dead men *shall live*, together with my dead body *shall they arise*. Awake and sing *ye that dwell in dust*: for thy dew shall be as the dew of herbs, and the earth *shall* cast out the dead." Does all this look like being a parallel with Rev. 20? And is it to be said, *after* the wicked "die the second death," "*thy* dead men *shall* live, together with *my dead body shall* they arise"? &c. Just as likely to our mind as that the 14th verse has its fulfillment *after* all men have arisen from the dead.

In connection with our view of Isa. 26: 14, let Isa. 43: 14–17—be considered—"Thus saith the LORD, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel: For your sake I have sent *to Babylon*, and have brought down all their *nobles*, and the Chaldeans, whose cry is in the ships. I am the LORD, your Holy One, the Creator of Israel, your King. Thus saith the LORD which maketh a way in the sea, and a path in the mighty waters; which bringeth forth a chariot and horse, the army and the power; they shall lie down together, *they shall not rise*: they *are extinct*, they are quenched as tow. The Septuagint reads—"Thus says the LORD * * * who *brought* forth chariots and horse, and a mighty multitude: but *they have lain down*, and shall *not rise*: they are extinct, as quenched flax."

Thus God confirms the same sentiment as that uttered Isa. 26: 14; and those "*lords* and nobles" are just about as likely to be revived into life as the dead *horses* and destroyed chariots: if one is to be "*brought forth*" from the grave into life so is the other. Will Br. H. pretend that the foregoing threatening is to be executed "at the last day," and that the "*horse and chariot*" are to "be brought forth" with "*a mighty multitude*" of the wicked to a second *extinction*? Believe it he cannot: his intelligence forbids it. No, "they *are* dead they *shall not live*," nor "*rise*."

Our brother's construction of the term "*together*," in Isa. 1: 28, and other texts, seems to us to avail nothing in proof of the wicked dead being made alive to have the destruction occur at one and the same time. The apostle saith "God * * * hath quickened us *together* with Christ, and hath raised us up *together*," &c. If this is to be applied to a literal resurrection, Christians were not quickened and raised up at the *same time* Christ was. If it applies to a moral or *spiritual* raising up and quickening, all Christians were not thus raised up and quickened at one and the same time, but "*one at a time*"; or a few here and there at different times; and yet "the Bible declares" they were quickened *together* with Christ," and "raised up *together*" &c. Now, what does this form of expression mean? Simply a *common* benefit—that which is common to all of whom it is spoken, with no idea that all received the blessing, or blessings, at one and the same time. So the common destiny of all the wicked is, to be destroyed—they are destroyed together—their destiny is one—it is common to them all; not that every individual sinner is destroyed at the same time, any more than all the apostles and their converts were made partakers of divine life at one and the same time; or that they all had their resurrection from the dead at the same time Christ had his, because "quickened *together with* him." So all sinners will have one common destiny, or be destroyed together with Adam, the earthy. *As* he died so will they.—And as Adam the spiritual was quickened into

life, so will all his followers be quickened *together with* him.

We feel unwilling, so soon, to travel over the same ground that the "Respondent" to Br. Grew did, on texts then considered; but as Br. H. has introduced them again, as if they had never been noticed, it may be proper to say something.

Job's expression that the "wicked is reserved to the day of destruction," and "they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath," may be understood in the sense of the certainty of their destruction, even though for a time they prosper in their wickedness, as in the case of Sodom, Gomorrah, Egypt, and the men of the old world. The day of wrath came to them and brought destruction.---They could not hide themselves from it, but were "brought forth" to it. That Job probably, had no reference to their being made alive from the dead appears from the fact that he immediately adds---"Yet shall he be brought to the *grave*, and shall *remain* in the tomb." And elsewhere, Job appearsto look to the righteous only as coming to life at the call of God. He seems to affirm in language quite positive, that there is more "hope for a tree cut down" than of man's revival from death, except the "virtuous man":---so *eesh*, translated *man*, Job. 14: 22, signifies, according to Prof. Pick. All others, Job appears to teach, are dead, to rise into life no more; and the 14th verse reads in the Septuagint, "For though a man die he *may be* revived, after finishing the days of this his life. I would wait patiently until I come again into existence. *Then* shalt thou call and *I* will answer thee," &c." Thus Job appears to make a revival to life *conditional*, dependent on character.

The whole connection of 2 Peter 2: 9, shows that the apostle had no such idea in his mind as that of the wicked *dead* being reserved to a future day of judgment to be punished. His argument is drawn from what God had done with wicked men in previous dispensations, while He had delivered His servants. If He had manifested this discrimination betwen the righteous and wicked; and reserved, *held*, or *kept* the wicked of the old world, and of Sodom, till their day of judgment came and they were *punished* with death, He "knoweth how," still to "deliver the godly out of temptations,"---or trials, as he did Noah, Lot and others---"and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished," after the "*ensample*" of the old world and Sodom; who, Peter tells us verse 6, were made "an *ensample* unto those that *after* should *live* ungodly": and as there was no "*ensample*" of the wicked dead being made *alive* in the cases referred to, we may be sure Peter had reference *only* to the living wicked, who should no more escape the judgment of *death* than the old world or Sodom did. God would reserve, hold, or keep them to that judgment, and they "shall be brought to the *grave and remain in the tomb*," after the "*ensample*" Peter spoke of.

If Br. H. *relies* on such passages as he has quoted "to prove that God does not *punish*" the wicked when they die," and that their death is not eternal, *we do not.* We are satisfied they prove no such thing. But they do prove that whatever attempts the wicked may make to escape the judgment, God has denounced against sinners, they cannot succeed---God will reserve, or hold them to it, and inflict it upon them.

Br. H. assumes that "the penalty of the Adamic law" is "executed against the *righteous*" as well as "the wicked." But he discovers a *slight* "difference," *viz;* "Death holds *pepetual* dominion over the" wicked "and only *temporary* dominion over the" righteous. If Br. H. thinks that a *small* "difference," we do do not. It is as wide as *death and life;* or as eternal darkness and night, and the kingdom of God. The fact is, the penalty of the Adamic law never is, and never was inflicted on the righteous. That penalty is not a *temporary* death: it is eternal, *irrevocable*, for the reasons we have already given. Adam came under it for his *personal* sins; and his posterity were exposed to come under it, and thus were "*perishing*" like as their father Adam *perished;* but "God so loved" them "that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* in him should *not perish* but have everlasting life." Those who believe in Christ do not die under the *penalty* of the Adamic law, but fall *asleep in* Christ, and live again with their living head: while those who reject Christ, or have no union with him, follow their Adamic head, and do fall under the penalty of interminable death, and shall not see life;---that is *receiving* "according to the deeds done in the body."

Each of the several *figurative* expressions, which Br. H. thinks will not be fulfilled, if our view is correct, have their ample fulfillment, all in one word—"*extermination*," or "*annihilation*." As fire devours and utterly destroys combustible matter cast into it, or on which it feeds, and cannot be restored, so doth *death* devour and annihilate all those *out of Christ;* just as sure and certain as the flood devoured and destroyed all those who were out of the Ark, in Noah's day. And when the day of judgment, which closes a dispensation, arrives, there is weeping and wailing among the wicked who are alive and remain unto that day; as in the cases of the old world, Sodom, Egypt, the Canaanites, the Jews, when God made Jerusalem a furnace of fire and it devoured the people as the burnings of lime, or as stubble fully dry. So will it be with the living wicked when Christ shall return from heaven. It is on them, and not on the wicked dead made alive, that fire from God out of heaven will descend and devour them. So we believe.

By the most "startling" and "thrilling" expressions God would impress men with the value of life and the awfulness of death—a death from which there is no possible means of recovery. The figures employed express the hopeless condition of all such as obey not God and refuse His offers of mercy. If Br. H. thinks these expressions are "trifling with the children of men," if God does not intend to make the wicked alive from the dead, and act---in miniature---the horrible tortures of the endless-torment believers, we are compelled to differ with him in opinion.

The questions with which Br. H. concludes his remarks have no force on our mind, because he assumes that the things spoken of cannot take place,

in a scriptural sense, unless all the wicked dead are made alive. We believe it has been shown, in the EXAMINER, that they can and will be fully accomplished, while the wicked dead shall "not see life." And it appears to us, with our present light, that the theory which embraces the living again of all the wicked dead, including Adam—the old world---Sodom and Gomorrah---the Canaanites----Pharoah and his hosts, that perished in the Sea----the wicked Jews who were "as the burning of lime" in the destruction of Jerusalem—with all of every class of ignorance in any age---is a theory "unreasonable, inconsistent, unscriptural." horrible, unreconcilable, dishonorable to the character of God, and strips the Gospel of its peculiar glory, making "Christ the minister of sin"; as an awful amount of blasphemy, cursing, and horrible wickedness will take place *after* such *re*-living of the wicked dead, which would never have occurred if Christ had not become *their* resurrection; and Br. H. admitted, as we have seen, they never could have lived again if Christ had not opened a resurrection to them.

We are perfectly willing to submit the question to the judgment of the candid and impartial reader. We wish to impose no restrictions on our brethren who hold the *affirmative* of the question at issue, which is, in fact, "*Is their positive testimony that the wicked dead will be made alive?*" Whether the *inferential* texts, that have mostly been relied on by the affirmative side, amount to *positive* testimony each one can judge for himself: we however are of opinion that if the prejudices of our previous education did not still cleave to us, we would find nothing in the Bible that would satisfy us that man would live again from the dead unless he "*died* IN *the Lord*;" which *union* secures his life, as it is the Spirit of God that makes alive from the dead. In this view how important that every sinner make haste to be united to Christ. Failing to do this, they perish----perish forever----die without hope---are utterly consumed through sin and death: for "if ye believe not that I am he," saith Jesus, "ye shall die in your sins." Dying in your sins, "where I go," he saith, "ye cannot come." Awful doom! An awful thing, sinners, to die. To shut your eyes eternally on life and on hope! "*Why will ye die?*"

From Dr. Thomas Huntington.

Brooklyn, Conn., March 17th, 1856.

Brother Storrs:---The books came safe to hand on Saturday, and I am now supplied with profitable reading for some time.

I have been thinking much of late of the declaration which the apostle makes respecting our Saviour that, "He made himself of no reputation." Human nature covets applause. I believe all mankind instinctively shrink from any course calculated to bring the decided disapprobation of friends and associates,---and, yet, if we examine the history of the world, this has been a prominent feature in the character of every child of God. The question comes up then, why is this? Is there *no* way in which we can serve God acceptably, and yet avoid this marked obloquy?

Now, if this question is answered in the negative, and no reason given, then there are multitudes who will declare the sentiment not only unfounded but unscriptural. It certainly is a very prevailing idea in the church, as well as in the world, that there is not *now* any call for singularity in religion. There are so many sects, and such an endless variety of religious sentiment, that any *reasonable* man may be accommodated with liberty of conscience, if he will but be contented to keep his peculiarities to himself, and not make himself offensive by censuring others who may think differently. But that seems to be the very difficulty. How *can* we do otherwise than *speak* what we so heartily *believe?* If it is "from the abundance of the heart that the mouth speaketh," how are we to bring ourselves to this *polite silence*, and pass through the world in a religious disguise, and nobody be either the wiser or the better for what we may have learned? That this *is* done, I do not deny; but that it is the right way to serve God, and secure his favor is another question. I do not believe myself that it is; and as my mere opinion may be of little value, I will appeal to the character of the Saviour as exhibited in the words of the apostle "*He made himself of no reputation.*"

I understand by this, that, the character which he *must* assume, and the conduct which he *must* pursue, placed him in perfect antagonism to the sentiments and ideas of those whom he came to benefit. He must either go back and leave mankind as he found them, or he must give them such *new ideas* both of themselves, and of God, as would unavoidably wound the pride of the human heart, and bring upon himself the contempt and hatred of all who were not already *prepared* to receive his instructions. His course was then a *necessary* one, and his character, in all respects, *indispensable*. And can we follow in his steps, and at the same time fare *differently?* Can any one speak truth as faithfully as he did, and be better received? I think not. Truth and error are *opposites*, and like two opposite things in nature they destroy each other. Mankind cannot love the light, if not ready to forsake evil when discovered. We must take then the legacy bequeathed us, as followers of Jesus, and be contented to bear our share of reproach for the truth's sake.

I do not suppose such ideas new to *you*. You have drank too deeply of the cup of self-denial to need such instruction from me; but there are those who do not see any necessity for such entire devotion to the cause of truth; and if man can be just as well saved in a creed but *half right*, as he can in one *wholly right*, then there is no such necessity. But if that be the case, why all the strenuous effort to convert the heathen? Are they so very much behind multitudes to be found in Protestant Christendom, that they must be given up as lost, while thousands around us are just as ignorant of Bible truth as they are? I have seen a man, *at full age*, on a death-bed who was born in New England, and the son of a professed Christian, who did not

know who Jesus Christ was, or what he had done to save man! And do you suppose such a fact must be a very wonder? I do not believe it would be found so rare, if we did but know how much ignorance there is respecting Bible truth, even in our own privileged land.

I bid you then, God speed, in your work of love and mercy. And may he who gave Abraham the victory over the heathen kings give you the same, and may you be made an abundant blessing to the people of God, and find your recompense at the resurrection of the just.

I remain, dear brother, yours in the truth.

From Eld. Jacob Blain, Buffalo, N. Y.

Br. Storrs—I wish to say to Brn. through the EXAMINER that I have issued another pamphlet of 48 pages, with a cover, entitled, GLAD TIDINGS, or *Bible proof that woe and sin are to end in the universe, by a literal destruction of the wicked.* All texts on future punishment collected and arranged. One design of this pamphlet is, to *condense* my work, "DEATH *not* LIFE," so as to have a still cheaper work on future punishment, with all the texts referred to, and so arranged as to be easily understood by new readers on the subjects. Another object is this---many will read a short work like this, who think they have not time to read a more lengthy one, and who, when they see how much the *Bible* says for our views on the end of the wicked, and how little for *eternal wailing*, may be induced to call for larger books.

My plan is—*first*, to refer to the 210 passages which prove *destruction*, &c., and make brief remarks on them---then quote the other classes of texts which have been perverted to prove endless misery, by *assuming* that men are immortal. I show that 284 texts have been wrongfully interpreted, and that they have no bearing against our doctrine. For this part of the work I have all new plates, and the matter newly arranged. Most of the rest will be that part of my work which removes the 15 main texts relied on to prove the popular doctrine; together with the argument for our views, and those of the Universalists. I give a brief history of our doctrine, and other useful matter on the covers.

Price $4 per 100, sent free of express charges; 20 copies for $1, free of postage.

Let me again ask brethren to think of the great consolation the truth has given to us, and make sacrifices to spread over gloomy Christendom, the GLAD TIDINGS, that SIN and WOE are to be ENDED.

From Eld. Z. Campbell.

SIGNS OF REFORM IN THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Extract from the M. E. Church Sabbath School Library, at Carbondale, Pa., 1855, from the "*Corner Stone*," p. 134 and 135.

"But the awful consequenees of sin among his creatures must be stopped; and in order to stop it, the wretched *souls* who choose it for their portion, *must be destroyed.* Destroyed! it is a strong expression, but God has chosen it: we take it from him and may not use a gentler one. 'All the wicked will God destroy:' 'The Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ—who shall be punished with everlasting *destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.' DESTRUCTION! It is a word, in regard to which, all comment is useless and argument vain: perverted ingenuity might modify and restrain every such expression as *eternal* and everlasting; but DESTRUCTION! it bids defiance to caveling."

Bro. Storrs :—I give the above as one of the signs of the times, in which we live. You will, no doubt, rejoice to learn that the murky clouds of *immortal soulism* begin to break and roll away, after so terrible a shower of endless torments as has been threatened the sinner for ages. Truth is mighty, and does occasionally, break through the adamantine walls of sectarianism. The day star has at length arisen on the long benighted M. E. Church. May it soon be followed by the splendor of the noon-day sun.

OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN is the most interesting work on the "*Lost Tribes of Israel*" we ever read. When our office was burned February 1855, we lost all those works we had. We have had calls for it, which we could not supply, and have taken the trouble to procure a few bound copies. *Price* 75 cents, sent free of postage.

"THE LIVING SOUL"---The next EXAMINER will contain a lengthy article on this topic, written by Z. CAMPBELL, which is truly "*original*," and is worth the subscription price of our paper for the year. The same paper will contain an article on "A PERSONAL ANTICHRIST," accompanied by a large extract from another *Tract*, from the English writer, of a late date. These articles will make our next issue one of deep interest to many; and we wish that all might read it. If any wish for *extra* copies we will furnish them at 5 *cents* per copy, if their orders are received before the paper goes to press. We have no doubt many will wish they had ordered *extras*, if they do not.

THE "ORIGINAL SIX SERMONS."—PHINEAS A. SMITH, *Rochester*, N. Y., has a quantity of these Sermons in the 18mo., or pamphlet, form; unconnected with any other matter. He will furnish them at the following prices, *viz*: 12 cents single: $1 12 per dozen: $9 per 100. Any person wishing that work should apply to him, as we have none. He also keeps a supply of *Bible* vs. *Tradition*.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, MAY 1, 1856. NO. 9.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE LIVING SOUL.

BY ELD. Z. CAMPBELL.

WHAT is the living soul? is a question which underlies the whole doctrine of Christianity. If man possess a *conscious immortal* nature, attribute, or principle; religion is *one* thing: if he does *not*, religion is *another* thing altogether different. And since this life is but a short one, it becomes the utmost desire to know if there is any existence beyond it.

This leads us to inquire—What is *life?* To this question we have no definite answer. Man, with all his boasted endowments, natural and acquired, has never been able to comprehend so much as one first principle. He has no means of obtaining a knowledge of anything but by, and through some created medium: hence all his mighty wisdom is nothing more than what he has found out by experience: and according to the proverb, he must be a fool; for a fool learns only in the dear school of experience. Humiliating as it is, man knows no more of the nature of a first principle than the inferior animals. Ask him, for instance, what is gold? and he will immediately begin to tell you of its *color, weight, ductility, malleability, value, uses, &c.;* and may give you a long lecture on it, or write you a volume: but still the mystery remains as profound as ever; for all he knows of its properties or qualites come through the thing called gold; and the question comes home with redoubled force, what is gold, independent of these qualities, or attributes? And so we ask, what is life? and immediately volumes are poured out, describing its *qualities*, and *attributes*, and the various media through which its existence is recognized: but these are only the various form of matter that exhibit life: and the question comes home with accelerated force; what is life, independent of all form of matter? This is a secret that angels have not revealed, and one that man is as ignorant of as the marble that marks his resting place. So of all first principles: if we rub smartly a glass rod with a dry silk, it attracts light bits of straw or paper; and if we ask the reason, we are told that by this process the glass has become *electrically excited:* —but this is only an unmeaning term to express what experience has first taught. It is but a miserable fig-leafed apron to clothe the young child that the experiment brought forth.

So all we know of any final and untangible principle is through the medium and process by which it is manifested. In like manner all we know of life is through the various forms of matter, in which it is manifested: and to say that life and consciousness in man exist independent of matter, is as preposterous and as presumptuous, as to say the *properties, uses,* and *value* of gold exist independent of the material thing called gold. Through matter alone comes all the knowledge we have of the thing called *gravitation;* and he would not be considered a sane man who would say that gravitation existed independent of matter. And since common sense must admit that nothing weighs nothing—that is, nothing does not possess weight,—it ought also, to admit that nothing does not possess life. Wherever there is weight, there must be *something* to preponderate: so where there is life there must be something to live.

So long as the soul lives, it must be a material something: for an immateriality, (which is a nothing) cannot live, any more than a nothing can preponderate.

When we say a certain body weighs *so much*, we make the body one thing, and its weight another; the weight, being one of its properties, cannot exist without the body: so when we say the soul lives; we make the soul one thing, and its life another; the life, being one of its properties, cannot exist without the soul.

So the general question runs thus—What is *Electricity, life, gravitation, light, thought, sense, the soul, motion, caloric, chemical affinity, cohesive attraction,* &c. &c., independent of matter? Nothing; *Nothing;* NOTHING.

But all these things, or rather attributes or qualities of things, *do* exist; and we gain a knowledge of them only through some of the varied forms of matter: and to talk of a man, or an ox, independent of, matter: or an immaterial soul or spirit, in the sense of an inner man, is as great an inverse paragon, as an immaterial horse.

But what shall we call these things; *primal, uncreated* properties? The term may be objectionable; but it is difficult to find one that is not. Such properties must exist forever, while organized bodies and forms of matter are continually changing, or being destroyed: and if their attributes are primal and uncreated, they are eternal. And if eternal, forms were made through which to exhibit them: but if forms were made, they were made of other forms, and some form of matter must have been eternal. But as properties can-

not exist independent of matter, so matter cannot exist independent of properties.

It follows then, that both matter and properties are *primal, uncreated.* But one God made all things that are made; for he is the one Maker of all forms; while the qualities of all attributes depend on their respective forms for their existence. And since these forms are continually being destroyed, their attributes are continually ceasing: or since forms are continually changing, all attributes of matter are continually changing.

So God only hath immortality, for he only is unchangable. Yet, when any form is destroyed, no primal attribute is annihilated, but changed: because the matter composing the form is not annihilated, but *changed.* For instance, a ton of anthracite has anthracitic properties; but when it is burned up, it is not anthracite; nor has it anthracitic properties; but it still exists in other forms of matter, and still has the *attributes* of other forms.

So a living man possesses living attributes, *soul* or *spirit,* and *consciousness:* but when he is burned up, his *soul,* or *spirit,* and *consciousness,* do not exist because the living man does not.—But we are told that his *soul, spirit,* and consciousness does not burn up. Very true; neither does the anthracitic properties of the coal burn up, when the coal burns: but these properties do not exist *after* the coal is burned. If matter, in any of its forms, possesses any property that cannot be destroyed, it is gravitation. The elementary principles which compose a ton of coal, still exist and weigh a ton after the coal is burned. Gravitation does not depend on the combination and arrangement of parts; but on the quantity of matter. Not so with life and consciousness, these do not depend on a definite amount of matter: therefore, gravitation comes nearer to the thing that "never dies" than the soul. But we must not understand that when a man dies, life, as a principle, is extinct. Other men still live: but the dead man lives not: *his* life only is extinct; and this is the very thing which is called death: the extinction of life in the form, or being possessing it.

As we have no means of detecting a principle except through some form of matter, we have no means of knowing that a man lives without a material body. As well might we say a severe pain existed where there is no material form through which it is manifested; as to say that consciousness exists where there is no material form to manifest it. He, who can tell me the dead are conscious, can tell me what they are conscious of; and what they are thinking about; and through what medium he gained the knowledge.

The same mode of reasoning applies to light.—It is a principle which existed from eternity; for "God is light." And here we may be asked, if he possesses a body, to manifest it through? It is only through material bodies that he has ever manifested himself to us; and none can show us a man, without a body that he has manifested himself unto; and as to his having a body—

"Know, then thyself: presume not God to scan;
"The proper study of mankind is man."

We are investigating men and material things, and their attributes for the benefit of those who are too wise to be taught by the world of God.—Hence we reason only from what we know. The sun is the luminary of the physical world, and a lamp is a miniature representation of it: but light as a principle, is not destroyed when the lamp is extinguished: but the light of the lamp is no more. But he who can tell what becomes of the *life, soul,* or *spirit* of a man when he dies, can also tell what becomes of the light of a lamp when it is extinguished.

Life is an uncreated attribute: "God is life." It can never cease because God is eternal. But if he imparts a portion of his own divine life to man; then man is part divine and part human, and his divine part will not only live forever, but it cannot sin or be punished; neither could it suffer while in a clay tenement. What then is human life, independent of a human body?

To those who seek wisdom through the tree of knowledge; we answer. An alkali possesses certain properties, the result of a union of elementary things. For instance; potash is composed of potassium (a metal) and oxygen. These, in combination, possess alkaline properties: but separate them, and their alkaline properties are destroyed; for neither the metal or the oxygen alone possess them. But re-unite them, and the alkaline property is restored. In their separate state they are not potash: in their united state, they are: and this is the sum of the matter. The *why* and the *wherefore,* we know not. The operation is called analysis and synthesis: the former decomposes, and destroys the alkali; and the latter re-composes, and restores the same.

This has a close resemblance to death and resurrection. There is one Great Chemist who can analyze a man and reduce him to dust as he was, and destroy his *thoughts* and *consciousness:* then synthesize his dust, and he becomes again a living man, with *thoughts* and *consciousness* restored.

When the potash is decomposed, a chemist would betray an ignorance of his art if he should say the alkali still existed: and so does the theologian, who says the soul exists, when the man is decomposed.

But says one; potash and men are very different things. True, and yet they are, in common with other things, just alike. They both owe their properties to their combination of parts. So when a man dies, his consciousness ceases until the dead *man* lives again. This must be admitted until it is demonstrated that the consciousness of a man lives without a body or parts. If man *has* such an existence, that existence can only be demonstrated through some tangible medium, and that medium must be his body and parts. So dead men must be dead until the resurrection: and if there be no resurrection, we may "eat and drink; for to-morrow, we die."

But we are told that life does not depend on an organization; for that is often complete, and yet without life.

True, but all organizations are more or less accompanied with circumstances to manifest results. Water will not turn a mill unless it tum-

bles down a precipice or rolls down an inclined plain. The existence of life requires not only an organization, but heat, and motion of a fluid; as in animal and vegetable life; and undoubtedly the play of an *electrical* fluid.

Yet what life is, independent of matter, we know not; but the great fountain of it is God, the highest order, and its only full embodiment.

The first order of beings, below him, endowed with it, that we have any account of, are angels; next, the Son of Man "a little lower than the angels"; then *man, beast, bird, fish,* and *insect.*— But it stops not with the animal kingdom: it slides into the vegetable so imperceptibly that we cannot tell where one begins and the other leaves off.

The zoophites are part animal and part vegetable, the connecting link between the two; a sure indication that both possess life. The vegetable kingdom unites again with the mineral in a second connecting link, by which life is poured into minerals.

So as far as life is concerned, man is on a level with the *animal, vegetable,* and *mineral* kingdoms.

Nor has he, by nature, more remarkable endowments, than many other forms. He has little or no inherent knowledge, and knows nothing but by experience, while the brute knows all by intuition and without experience.

The first swarm of bees, by instinct, formed more perfect hexagons and a better form of government than man has been able to do after going to school six thousand years. The uneducated brute is the better physician. Man spends long years at his books to qualify himself to combat disease and then kills ten patients as often as he cures one. But the brute goes into the fields, nature's apothecary shop; deals out the potion: takes, or administers it, and never fails to cure.— But when on the point to die, takes no medicine at all; while the learned doctor gives his nostrums, alike to the living and dying. The beast, too, is the better navigator: he will traverse the dense forest, the desert or the trackless ocean without chart or compass, and put his helm to port, be it foggy or fair, with unerring certainty.

Even the spider excells him in the art of spinning and drawing mathematical lines, and all by intuition. The beaver and musk-rat have outstripped even the Herschels in the science of Astronomy by their wonderful fore-knowledge of tides and tempests; and other animals, by their prescience of the length and severity of an approaching winter. The brute has indeed seized on the end of all useful science, without going over the ground of acquirement. His instinct is a higher grade of knowledge than the acquired wisdom of man.— His life, therefore, has a higher claim to immortality. He is less liable to err: his instinctive mind grasps its object with a greater degree of certainty. His mind is *nature,* while the mind of man is *education.*

But man boasts his superiority over the brute in consequence of his superior reasoning faculty. But this faculty is the creature of erring education, and is not a gift of nature, like instinct; if it was, children could reason as well as adults. Also if it was a gift of nature, it would, like instinct, be unerring. But man, being nearly deprived of animal instinct, is left to seek a compensation in the miserable substitute, called reason. Instinct must be right; it is unerring nature, a higher endowment than reason, and runs through all forms of life.

The twiners run towards the nearest support and lay hold of it, and twine around it: and if that support be removed, they will turn again and seek the next nearest. This, in a brute, is called *instinct;* and in a man, *wisdom;* and in the hop-vine, *vegetable economy.*

The hen, with maternal care, gathers her brood under her wings, to protect them from the cold damp air of evening: and in like-manner plants fold their sepals and petals around their germs which contain their seedlings, the young and tender embryos of the succeeding generations, the vegetable chickens, brooded by the same maternal care. The Christian mother folds her young and tender infant to her bosom from whence it receives warmth and nourishment; being taught her pious duty by the same Being who taught it to the *beast,* the *bird,* and the *rose.* One principle runs through the whole, equally to accomplish the same purpose; while man exclaims—"See my superior soul"! Nor does this instinctive principle stop in the animal and vegetable kingdom.— The great sea of matter itself is impregnated with it.

The planets belonging to our system, revolve one way about the sun; *viz:* from west, by south, into the east: they turn on their axis the same way; and almost all plants, that twine about a support take the same direction; as also the innumerable coils of sea and fresh water shell-fish. One primal law pervades the whole.

By this law, the mighty orbs that circle the sun produce their days, nights, and seasons. Here action is directed to accomplish an end. Now when man acts with such a design, we say he acts from the impulse of a sane mind. But we see *planets,* and *suns, man, beast, birds,* and *vegetables,* with the same design, acting to accomplish an end.

And until we know what mind is, we have no right to say that one form of matter acts consistently from the impulse of mind, and that other forms acting equally as consistently, are blindly compelled to act by the laws of nature. Mind is a law of nature, and all we know of it is its effects. Thus we see that what is improperly called inanimate matter acts with a design; and this is the only proof that man possesses a mind.

Man possesses the sense of feeling; and this is equally true of the brute; yet there are *some* of so low an order that they give no evidence that they possess this faculty: in this respect they seem inferior to the sensitive plant.

So where *soul, life, mind,* and *will* begin and end, we know not; or rather we know they begin with God and end unknown. All created, sublunar things, are matter; mere dust, in various forms. One form of it, called wood, is made into a cart and loaded with dirt: another parcel of dust

is harnessed to it for a team; and another lump of the same earth is seen in the forward end of the cart for a driver; and away goes the whole together. Behold I have shown you a mystery; let him explain it, who can.

"And are but parts of one stupendous whole,
"Whose body nature is, and God the soul."

And yet proud man exclaims—"*I* only have a soul!"

Alas! thou erring lump of earth: God is no respecter of forms of dust, for he made them all; and he gave *yours* a soul to fit it for a sphere he designed it to move in; and to every lump, a soul to fit it to its *own* sphere. Let us descend a step lower in created forms, and we see the same mysterious principle at work in the mineral kingdom.—This is observable in the science of crystalography. Any substance dissolved in a solvent, and crystalized, exhibits a wonderful design to accomplish an end. Submit the solution, containing the dissolved substance to a high magnifying power, and evaporate it; and the first appearance of the infinitessimals of matter are seen coming together and turning over and round, so as to unite in due form to complete a perfect and regularly formed body called a crystal. Now by what *instinct, mind, or soul*, do these particles shape themselves, and move together to form a body? and who is their marshal to arrange them into *cubes, prisms, rhombs, octahedrons*, and a multitude of other forms? It is what we call *mind* in man; *instinct* in brutes; *vegetable economy* in plants; and may be called *mineral economy* in crystals; but if we call it *chemical affinity*, still the term is as unintelligible as that of *mind*. But it is all one and the same thing, "THE SOUL OF MATTER."

It exists in every form; and ceases to exist when the form is destroyed. As the identity of the soul-principle depends on the identity of the form; the soul or mind cannot exist without the identity of the form. For instance; man, as a material living being, possesses a mind; one that is identically the mind of one individual; and not the mind of another: but on the dissolution of the individual, this individual and identical mind ceases to exist until the material man re-assumes his individual and identical form. This is death and resurrection: in which the identity of the material form and the identity of the mind both stand or fall together. And since matter cannot exist without attributes, and attributes cannot exist without matter; souls cannot exist without bodies of some grade; and bodies cannot exist without *souls* of some grade. It follows, then, that living and conscious forms must possess living and conscious souls (or attributes; call them what we may,) and inanimate forms must possess inanimate souls. There is, therefore, nothing more scientifically correct than the language—"Man became a living soul." For as soon as he became alive—*the man* was the *living soul*; and the living soul was the man.

It will now be in place to consider in what respect is man superior to other animals. It is not because he has any *quality, property*, or *soul* less independent of his material form and organization: but because he has powers and faculties preeminent and peculiar to his *own* organization.

One peculiar trait in his character is, his superior ability to learn by experience, and his insatiable thirst for knowledge, and to obtain it in his own strength. From this circumstance he has acquired a better general knowledge of things: while the lower animals possess a better intuitive knowledge of particular things. This endowment, with his superior reflective faculty, brought him into collision with the revealed will of his Creator, *by* whom and *to* whom he becomes accountable for his conduct. No doubt he was made endowed with a higher instinct (amounting nearly to inspiration) than any other animal,—And had he continued in his primal state, his instinctive powers would have kept him superior in intuitive knowledge to all other earthly beings.

But as he was a free agent, he departed from his primal, intuitive knowledge, which is given only on the spur of the moment, and chose his own way of seeking wisdom by relying on his own strength rather than on his Creator, and sought wisdom in advance of his necessities. This is not in accordance to the order of nature; which is—"Give us this day our daily bread."

The lower animals have not perverted this order; and they receive from the bountiful hand of their Creator *all* they really need; *what* they need; and *when* they need. But this ever bountiful hand supplies no faster than the present want of the creature demands; and this keeps the creature just where he should be; ever dependent on the Great Giver.

The sparrow receives her food, day by day, taking no thought for to-morrow. She has no artificial wants; and because she has not tasted the tree of knowledge she has no ability to *create them*. But not so with fallen man; he multiplies his wants, and then unjustly complains that God does not supply them.

The animals, by intuition, take no thought for to-morrow; therefore God supplies their *real* wants day by day: while man having fallen from intuitive wisdom, is left to himself, to rely on his own resources, and to multiply his artificial wants and supply them the best way he can. This is the wretched effect of artificial knowledge, to lead us to trust in ourselves rather than in God. The tree being tasted, man fell from intuitive and unerring, day by day wisdom, to self education: and from an unerring principle to an erring one: thus taking the business of teaching true wisdom out of the hand of God and assuming it himself. This is the world's great error: men are more willing to be taught of erring men, than to be taught of an unerring God. No wonder, therefore, that human wisdom is inferior to brute instinct; for man is taught of man, while the beast is taught of God.

Man is in a fallen state, the brute is not, therefore his instinct remains a monument of the excellency of man's unfallen nature, and what it will be when restored.

We must now inquire why man was made thus

liable to so disastrous a reverse of fortune. He was made to fill a certain sphere that no other being could: for there are as many spheres to fill as there are forms to fill them. And man, to fill his sphere, must have been endowed with just such faculties. And had he been endowed with faculties high enough to have kept him from sinning, he would have been an angel, or some being fitted for a higher sphere. And had his endowments been not high enough to have sinned, then he would have been a brute, or some animal fitted for a lower sphere: in either case there would not have been found a man to till the ground.

His primal state was mere animal; and as such he had no hope of eternal life. This hope was made to hang on his obedience to God, and consequent right to the tree of life. But he could not have been a subject of obedience unless he was liable to disobedience. "For the creature was made subject [i. e. *liable*] to vanity [or sin] not willing, but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in hope." His primal condition was liability to sin and die like a brute, or to obey and live forever. But to obey, is to pursue virtue, and to pursue virtue, is to pursue happiness: and a happy life is the only one fit for eternal duration, and the only one that can attain to it: for, an eternal unhappy life cannot enter into the divine plan of a good Being. Therefore, eternal life hangs on the pursuit of virtue. But virtue consists only in overcoming an evil; and where there is no evil to overcome, there is no virtue to practice and no hope of eternal life. It was therefore necessary to put before the creature man a tempting evil to overcome, as a stepping stone to a higher state.—By this divine arrangement a lower order of beings were made susceptible of attaining to a higher state: and yet not hurl from their sphere any higher order of beings. Now there can be no "Universal Progression." For as the whole of any thing is equal to the sum of all its parts, as long as there are parts, the parts *must be* parts: and one part cannot be another part, without crowding another part out of its place.

We have shown that one universal soul, variously modified, pervades the great sea of matter; and if it is progressive in one form it is in another; and the lower forms must be continually hurling those above from their sphere: until each by turns dethrone the Almighty, and leave a perfect blank behind.

The first progress made by human wisdom was *downward;* and six thousand years of self education has not brought man up to the high state from which he fell, nor even placed him on the level with the intuitive knowledge of the lower animals. Nothing but a change of education can raise the fallen creature; and that change is the work of grace to turn men from their interdicted knowledge to the revealed will of God This is given through the holy prophets and apostles; and is inspired wisdom; and must have been the instinctive wisdom of man prior to that obtained through the forbidden tree. The fruit of this tree is a miserable substitute for kind nature's unerring instinct; and is what Isaiah 25: 7, calls "the vail that is spread over all nations," and will be destroyed, or, as the margin reads *swallowed up* in the future age, in the restitution of all things: when, as Joel says—God will pour out his Spirit upon all flesh.

In the restitution, Christ and his saints will be the full embodiment of this Spirit, through which true knowledge will be disseminated to all nations. And as the interdicted tree-knowledge and the curse go hand in hand, in this world; so in the world to come, the restored intuitive knowledge and the blessing to all nations are inseparably connected.

HOW THEY TALK!

Bro. Storrs.—A writer in the March number of the "*Guide to Holiness*," in an article on "The Last Words of Christ," utters a sentiment which it may be well to record in the EXAMINER as *another* "curiosity." Hear him in his own words.

"IT IS ONE OF THOSE PARADOXES WHICH CHRISTIANITY ALONE PRESENTS, THAT THE END OF LIFE IS ITS BEGINNING."

Before remarking upon the sentiment which the latter clause of this quotation expresses, two mistakes in what the writer affirms respecting it may be pointed out. 1. He calls it a *paradox*. Now what is that? Dr. Webster's definition is as follows: "*Paradox*—A proposition contrary to received opinion, or seemingly absurd, yet true in fact." Here we learn that "a proposition" may be paradoxical in *two* ways, the *first* of which is that it be "contrary to received opinion." Tried by this first definition, the notion that "*the* END *of* LIFE *is its* BEGINNING" is no *paradox*, for, unfortunately, it happens to be in *exact harmony* with "received opinion." As this will not be denied, it is needless to prove it. "But," it may be asked, "is it not paradoxical in the sense of Webster's *second* definition?" I answer, it is *not*. "What!" continues the inquirer, is it not "*seemingly absurd*" to say that "the *end* of life is its *beginning?*" I answer unhesitatingly, *Yes*, "well then," it is asked, "how do you escape the conclusion that the sentiment in question is *paradoxical?*" I answer, because it lacks the *essential* element of being "*true in fact.*" Indeed, nothing could be more palpably *un*true! Is it asked, then, what the sentiment *is*, if it be not a *paradox?* I answer, it is a most *bare-faced* ABSURDITY, for (in harmony with Webster's definition of what an *absurdity* is) it has "the quality of being *inconsistent* with *obvious truth*, reason" and "sound judgment." 2. The writer in the "Guide" makes "*Christianity*," and it "*alone*," responsible for the *absurdity* which he *miss*-calls a *paradox*. If by "Christianity" he has reference to the system of truth revealed in the Book of God, he greatly errs in supposing that it countenances the nonsensical dogma that life's "*end*" and "its *beginning*" are one and the same thing! "Christianity *alone*" inculcates an entirely different view, and it is to be deplored that so many stumble over its plain and simple teachings. It is everywhere manifest in the Bible that the "end of life" with "man" (whom "the Lord God formed of the *dust*

of the ground") involves a *dissolution of his being*—a return to *dust* and *unconsciousness:* and that he is to "*live again*," if at all, by means of a "*resurrection* at the last day." But even if it were true that the sentiment quoted from the "Guide" were a *paradox*, and that it constituted one of the features of "Christianity," there would be no warrant for affirming that it belongs to "Christianity *alone*," for *heathenism*, unblest of Revelation, brought to light, long prior to the utterance of either the *first* or "*last* words of Christ," the amazing discovery that ☞ "the *end* of life is its *beginning!*" ☜

What is "*life*"? Dr. Webster says it is "that state of an organized being in which its natural functions and motions are performed, or in which its organs are capable of performing their functions." In the BIBLE EXAMINER for September, 1849, we have the following excellent definition: "LIFE is a word *primarily* used to express the active or living condition of the organic substances of sensitive creatures whose general condition is one of consciousness." In the same EXAMINER this definition was *proved* to be the *Scriptural* one. Let it, or Mr. Webster's definition, be accepted, and what becomes of—"the END of LIFE is its BEGINNING"? It vanishes "like the baseless fabric of a vision!" May the Lord grant that an end of such perversions of important truth, and the "beginning" of better days, may soon gladden the hearts of those who, while they seek to shun "vain philosophy" in all its forms, are anxious to adhere faithfully to "the law and the testimony" and to "speak according to this word." Yours in Hope, W.

THE REVISED AND ENLARGED SIX SERMONS.—A few texts have been passed in these sermons, without special notice, which some rely on as proof of the immortality of man and the endless sin and suffering of the wicked. They were passed simply because they involved the State of the Dead which the author of the Six Sermons thought best to take up in another work of a more general character. The Rich Man and Lazarus is one of the texts passed. A single remark here is all that is necessary on it till the state of the dead is under consideration.

Suppose the rich man to be actually in a conscious state after death, and in torment, it does not prove him immortal, or that his conscious suffering is to be eternal: for, the advocates of the immortality of man admit the state of the rich man, spoken of, was immediately after death and *before* the day of judgment. Hence, whatever his state is now it is not his *proper* punishment—that may be utter annihilation for all there is in the text to prove the contrary: he has not yet passed the judgment; when he has, then comes the real punishment, and the Scriptures elsewhere must determine what it is. We have positive testmony that "*The wages of sin is Death:*" Rom. 6: 23.

The phrase "immortal soul" is not once found in the Old and New Testament Scriptures; either in our translation or the original languages in which they were written; while—among many other terms which clearly express the idea of deprivation of life—that of *annihilation* is found distinctly in the Hebrew Scriptures as expressive of the doom of the wicked.

Prof. Pick, in his "*Bible Student's Concordance*"—a work of great value to a mere English scholar—gives us two original terms, the *literal* signification of which is, "*to annihilate:*" and these terms are applied to the destiny of wicked men in such connection as to make it certain that the Spirit of God—which inspired "holy men of old"—designed to teach the utter extirpation of the wicked, and not a *preservation* in any living state. These Hebrew terms are *Tsomath* and *Shomad*. In our translation they are sometimes rendered *destroy*, *destroyed*, and *cut off*. According to Prof. Pick there are about forty different Hebrew words that are translated destroy and destroyed. We will give a few instances where the terms occur, the literal signification of which, he tells us, is "*to annihilate.*" In Psa. 18: 40 *tsomath* occurs. None doubt but that a portion of this Psalm is prophetical of Messiah and what he will do. Thus speaks the word of prophecy—"Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies; that I may *tsomath—annihilate* them that hate me." Saith Jesus, Luke 19: 27, when the Nobleman shall return he will say—"Those *mine enemies*, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and *slay* them before me." Thus the prophecy, in Psa. 18, is to have a fulfillment when Messiah, who is to be King on David's throne, shall "return from heaven." So Paul declares, on that return the disobedient "shall be punished with everlasting destruction:" 2 Thes. 1: 9. Thus the Prophet, our Lord, and Paul, witness together, the enemies of Christ are to be *annihilated.*

Again prophecy thus speaks, Psa. 54: 5—"He [God] shall reward evil unto mine enemies: *tsomath—annihilate* them in thy truth." The truth of God is, the wicked shall be *annihilated.*

In Psa. 94: 23, *tsomath* occurs twice; and the verse literally reads thus—"He shall bring upon them their own iniquity, and shall *annihilate* them in their own wickedness: yea, the LORD our

God shall *annihilate* them." Thus the fate of the wicked is clearly stated.

In Psa. 101 : 8, *tsomath* occurs twice; and as the language is clearly prophetical of Messiah it speaks in language not to be mistaken. "I will early *annihilate all* the wicked of the land; that I may *annihilate* all the wicked doers from the city of the Lord."

Once more, Psa. 143 : 12, David personating Messiah, prays—"Of thy mercy *annihilate* mine enemies, and *annihilate all* them that afflict my soul."

Finally, Psa. 145 : 20, we read—"The LORD *preserveth* all them that love him : but *all* the wicked will he *shomad—annihilate*."

These examples are amply sufficient to warrant us in using the term annihilation in relation to the destiny of all the enemies of God. Those who choose to deny it, and affirm that such a disposal of them is *impossible*, we leave to settle their controversy with Him who cannot lie, and whose word abideth forever. We believe that men who reject Christ as the *Life-Giver* will be eternally excluded from life—"be no more"—"be as though they had not been :" Psa. 104 : 35. Obadiah 16.—"The wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the LORD shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume : into smoke shall they consume away." Psa. 37 : 20. Thus do the wicked PERISH UTTERLY AND FOREVER.

ORANGE SCOTT, founder of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in the United States, said in 1846 :

"The plainest principles of the gospel have slumbered for ages.

"The Church is as deeply infected with a desire for worldly gain, as the world. At least there is *no perceptible* difference. Professors of religion are emphatically worldly minded.

"The Church are making a god of this world.

"Most of the denominations of the present day might be called Churches of the world, with more propriety than Churches of Christ.

"The Churches are so far gone from primitive Christianity that they need a fresh regeneration—a new kind of religion.

"They have gone over to the world and have opposed what the world opposed.

"The world will never be converted by such a religion.

"Christians *pray* for the union of the Churches, but *fight* against it.

"The fact cannot be disguised that the ways of Zion mourn."

Such sentiments are worthy of him who uttered them. We knew O. SCOTT well. He never would, we are persuaded, had he lived, have taken ground against the great *life theme* we have so long labored to promote. He gave us encouraging words at the outset, and wrote us afterwards that he could "not come out against" us! He often said to others—as we have been informed—"If you can refute Bro. STORRS' *arguments* do it—*I cannot.*"

It is a solemn truth, if "the world" were to "be converted" it never could be done "by such a religion" as that which goes under the name of "*orthodox*" in these days. *Thought* is not to be crushed by the dictation of Creeds and Priests.—Thought, free, must and will reject the creedized notions of God and His government of the souls He has made. The churches must change their ground, or be swallowed up with the coming flood. Let them learn to give such representations of God and his government as shall commend itself to the understandings and consciences of intelligent beings. Will they do it?

HARMONY IN FAMILY.—1. We may be quite sure our will is likely to be crossed in the day, so prepare for it. 2. Everybody in the house has an evil nature as well as ourselves, and therefore we are not to expect too much. 3. To learn the different temper of each individual. 4. To look upon each member of the family as one whose soul we are bound to watch, as those that must give account. 5. When any good happens to any one to rejoice at it. 6. When inclined to give an angry answer, to lift up the heart in prayer. 7. If from sickness, pain or infirmity, we feel irritable, to keep a very strict watch over ourselves. 8. To observe when others are so suffering, and drop a word of kindness and sympathy suited to them. 9. To watch for little opportunities of pleasing, and to put little annoyances out of the way. 10. To take a cheerful view of every thing, and encourage hope. 11. To speak kindly to the servants, and praise them for little things when you can 12. In all little pleasures which may occur, to put self last. 13. To try for "the soft answer that turneth away wrath." 14. When we have been pained by an unkind word or deed, to ask ourselves, "Have I not often done the same, and been forgiven?" 15. In conversation not to exalt ourselves, but bring others forward. 16. To be very gentle with the younger ones, and treat them with respect.—17. Never to judge one another, but attribute a good motive when we can.—*Christian Treasury.*

OUR CORRESPONDENT will excuse us for delaying to insert his *strictures* on the extracts we have been giving from Dr. MCCULLOH's work. We have not finished those extracts; and the remainder will embrace texts our Correspondent has urged in opposition. Till those texts are presented and the author's views of them known, it would seem not in time to urge them against him.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, May 1, 1856.

A PERSONAL ANTI-CHRIST.

For the last ten years it has been our conviction that there would be a *personal anti christ:* that one individual, *alone*, must be that "*wicked*" one, who would answer the description of revelation; and that he must immediately precede the return of the true Christ from heaven. That anti-christ, we think, will be received by the Jews as their Messiah; and hence he must be the patron of their nationality and be the means of their national restoration, and raise their expectations of national and worldly greatness. This alone would answer their ideas of Messiah. Whenever an individual can be found that bids fair to do this he would be likely to be proclaimed by them as their long looked for Messiah; and into league with him they would soon enter. Such an individual would be "*the* anti-christ." There have been "many anti-christs"; but "*the* anti-christ," we are confident, has never yet been revealed. "He is *the* anti-christ that denieth both the Father and the Son": 1 John 2: 22. It is essentially an *atheistic* power, and "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped," &c. 2 Thess. 2: 4. Papacy may be a *type* of this anti-christ, but it has never filled up the prophetic description. Hence we have looked for some other development that should answer to it. This view has kept us clear of all those "*definite time*" movements, which have so disturbed and distracted many minds for the last ten years.

From what quarter "*the* anti-christ" was to arise, or how be developed, we have not been satisfied, nor are we certain now; tho' we confess we have long looked to France and the French Emperor as most likely to give the world that development. We took the ground, as the readers of the EXAMINER know, at the very time the *Napoleon* Dynasty was revived that it was "the beast that *was*, and *is not*, and *yet is*," Rev. 17: 8; or, that it is the scarlet colored beast" of that chapter; which should "ascend out of the bottomless pit" to the "*wonder*"—astonishment—of them "that dwell on the earth." That dynasty was overthrown in the person of Napoleon I., and cast into the bottomless pit at the desolate rock of St. Helena. Those who regarded not prophecy said, "*it is not*" —which was true for the time—but they saw not that the time should come when the prophecy should be responded to, and the voice of history should proclaim, it "*yet is.*"

On this point, we were forcibly struck with a paragraph in the *Tribune* of this city, of March 29. The hatred of the *Tribune* to the Napoleon dynasty is manifest in all it says relative to it; yet in the article referred to, headed "*The Revenges of Time*" it says:—

"It is but a little more than forty years since Walter Scott, expressing the intensity of the dread and hatred Napoleon had excited in the British heart, said in his haste that he should have been put to death as a noxious animal or a felon. For more than twenty years England had bent all her corporal and mental energies to the task of defeating and chastising the French Revolution. Hundreds of millions of money, and tens of thousands of lives had been lavished in the crusade, and it seemed at last successful. The *wicked Genius* had been seized, *imprisoned in the fatal casket*, sealed with the signet of Solomon and *cast into the sea, to trouble the world no more. And lo! the casket has been fished up and opened, and the Imperial Shadow rules over Europe* from behind the throne which owes all its pageantry and power to the magic of his name. And England has taken his successor (*his*, whose empty title she would never allow, even in courtesy!) to her bosom, and kissed him on either cheek, and bound her Garter below his knee, and followed him to the war which his necessities required, and is about to acquiesce in the peace which his needs now demand! How the ghost of the conqueror must 'laugh and shake his ears' in the Elysean Fields, in thus posthumously trampling over his enemies and ruling the nations from his urn!"

We have italicised that part of the foregoing paragraph which tallies so well with prophecy.—That *dynasty*—hated, dreaded, overthrown, "cast into the sea"—"is not." But shortly it ascends out of the *abussou*—"bottomless pit"—*the abyss;* it is "*fished up*," and behold its "Imperial Shadow rules over Europe": it "*yet is.*" "He is the eighth, and is of the seven." The present French dynasty is not a new one, but a previous one *revived: viz.* the "short spaced" dynasty of Rev. 17: 10. The Napoleon dynasty has been a wonderful one from its outset; and never more wonderful than in its revival; and we confess we are strongly impressed that it will yet be developed "*the* anti-christ"; though we wish to express nothing with positiveness in the matter.

We have given our readers extracts occasionally, from the *Tracts* which are issued monthly, by a minister of the Church of England; and as many of his views harmonize with our own we have sometimes extracted largely. We however differ with him materially in some things, and it must not be supposed that we indorse all the expressions in the extracts; yet there is so much

matter for thoughts we have judged best to give our readers a portion of his views. In his Tract, published March last, speaking of Napoleon III, he says :—

"He indulges in war only just so far as to lay the foundation of an universal empire. But he does not profess to be a military man, still less to be a conqueror. The appropriate time has not come, and he is kept under restraint, with the character of being the most excellent of men, and the pacificator of Europe. In short, "his empire is peace!"

But though his empire be peace, his *end* is not peace. A new crisis is to occur in the world's history. Satan is to be cast down to the earth, and the period of his prophetic judgment is to begin. Then Satan, as we know from the 13th of Revelation, is to give to the Eighth Head his power, and his throne, and great authority. The first thing which Satan does is to put it into the mind of the Eighth Head to *revive the Roman Empire!* All the frame-work of that empire is already in his hands. Rome, Athens, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, and along with this the subservient admiration of half the world—England itself being his most devoted ally! Having thus set up the frame-work, having thus laid the foundations, it will be as easy as it will be natural to complete the work by the absolute revival of the Roman empire. Having succeeded so marvellously until then, his ambition will not rest till he have completed the work. He will fix his eyes upon the laurels of the Cæsars, and determine to revive the empire of the Cæsars in his own person. He will place himself at the head of his armies as a Roman 'Imperator,' and go forth in the strength of Satan, conquering and to conquer. A most momentous event. A new epoch in the world and the commencement of the greatest day which man has ever seen!

It must be here observed, that the Devil is always an imitator or mimic of the Divine counsels. God has set up his own Son as universal monarch, and, therefore, the Devil strives to anticipate the kingdom of Christ by establishing the universal monarchy of Antichrist. On the same principle, the Devil will imitate the attributes of the Lord in the attributes of the Eighth Head. Christ is a conqueror—so is Antichrist. Christ commands the armies of heaven—Antichrist will command the armies of the earth. The one holds in his hands the dread artillery of heaven, the other directs the artillery of the earth. God sets *his* king upon the hill of Zion, as head of the fifth monarchy, which supersedes the four monarchies of the Gentiles. The Devil sets his king upon the hills of Rome, as head of the four Gentile monarchies in the form of a confederated empire. What God designs, the Devil anticipates and parodies.—* * * We see before us at this day a powerful monarch, master of the finest army in the world, full of ambition, and with a fatal reliance upon his destiny and his STAR. His name is associated with war and victory. That great name rung out first in the wars of Europe, above the thunders of the battle field, and silenced every other sound.—It is still the greatest of modern names, and has no rival but the name of Cæsar. To unite the *two*—to bring the great name of antiquity into union with the great name of modern times—to bring Cæsar and Napoleon within the same superscription—what a triumph would that be! To collect all the glories of the age, and to bind them together with the glories of antiquity, to form *one* chaplet for one head; is a design not unworthy the loftiest genius. To revive the old Roman empire would be greater still. Hitherto everything has been propitious. The abutments of the imperial arch have been laid. First, France with Paris as its centre; next Rome itself, the very city of the Cæsars; then Athens, Constantinople and the Bosphorus; now Jerusalem just taken in hand. The French Ambassador has returned to Paris from Jerusalem, with a black list of no less than *eight* of the Holy places forcibly usurped by the Greek Church, and taken from the Latin Church. Of this we warned our readers before, and now it is coming out. In due time the protector of the Latins must assert the right of his own Church, and reclaim those eight holy places if necessary by force of arms. This will make him master of JERUSALEM. His name and influence are spread far and wide; and he has made a treaty even with Persia, the representative of the third empire of Daniel. His name, his army, his influence, his occupation of the great capitals of the Roman empire—all these united are the framework of the empire itself. There is little now required but to fill in the figure, and to animate the body with one pervading spirit. What a temptation to ambition; but above all to one who has the renown of the first Napoleon in his charge. We know not how soon the time may come for the attempt; and when it does come he will not mistake the prompting of his destiny. In two years he has moved over the entire space from Paris to Jerusalem. It is not yet two years since he was no more than Emperor of France; he is now in military occupation of the capitals of the East, and the principal patron of the Jerusalem Churches. A long stride within twenty-two months—how much further may he not advance in as many more?

Nor is it to be imagined that this revival of the Roman empire is impossible, on account of the opposition that it would encounter. It is a common idea that it could not be effected without an open avowal, like the construction of the Napoleonic empire! This is manifestly an error. Who was it that got possession of Rome, Constantinople, and the Bosphorus? Not a *conqueror*; not at all! Only a *pacificator*. Who gained the foremost place at Jerusalem? Not a conqueror, only a man of peace! Who got up a war with Russia when it suited him, and now commands that war to cease before half the work is done?—the best of men! Who has made the British nation his tool, and is now laying them aside?—the most faithful of allies! What would bring another man to an unhappy end only raises him the higher. What no other man could do without being at war with half Europe *he* has done as the genius of peace. War, indeed, he has

had just as long as it was indispensable, but never a moment longer. He may do the same again until he have united the Roman world to himself under the name of peace. We need by no means imagine that the Roman empire will be revived as an UNITARY empire, as a single monarchy, like the empire of the Cæsars. A *federal* empire will serve the same purpose, and can be constructed without envy or opposition. * * *

We know that the reign of Antichrist (as Antichrist) is to continue for three years and a half, that is to say, for the second half of the week.—But the other half is still to be accounted for.—No doubt it will be occupied by the Eighth Head in establishing his empire and extending his influence, before he ventures to set up his Antichristian claims. The first half of the week (or of the seven years) being spent in preparation; the second half being occupied by the Antichristian apostacy in its full maturity.

The last week of Daniel seems to furnish a very satisfactory definition of the future course of the Eighth Head. It will be the period of the Antichrist, or Eighth Head, in his double character, first as a Roman emperor and conqueror, and next as the man of sin in his full development as Antichrist. * * * It is absolutely *certain*, from the 9th of Daniel, that the Eighth Head of the Roman empire will form a seven years' league with the Jewish nation, and, consequently, he must be a man of eminence and power from the very beginning of those seven years, since, otherwise he would not be in a position to form a league with the Jews nor would the Jews think it worth their while to form a league with him. (See Daniel 9th, verse 27th.) These considerations will, therefore, enable us to arrive at a clearer and more definite view of the approaching crisis.

The Eighth Head of the Roman empire, or Antichrist, has then before him a period of seven years, the last week of Daniel, which is to include the whole of his *prophetic* operations. He may be a powerful monarch long before, but his operations as a *prophetic* person, those operations which prophecy has marked out, are to be included in the period of "SEVEN YEARS." At the very opening of the "seven years" Daniel informs us that this Roman emperor will form a league with the Jews. This Jewish league is, therefore, the starting point in the career of the Eighth Head.—It decides at one glance the point from which he starts in running his course. We cannot venture to make any positive assertions, but, as far as we can judge, such a league may now be formed with the Jews almost immediately. The Jews are more than ever desirous of returning to their own land and rebuilding their Temple. The East has been thrown open by the war. A large military force occupies Constantinople: the principal part of that force (both naval and military) is in the hands of one man, who is just now directing his attention particularly to Jerusalem, and getting possession of the holy places. His want of money is notorious, for the war has been most expensive; and the wealth of the Jews is equally well known. He is, also, on the most intimate terms with the wealthiest of all the Jews, and one who, in fact, represents the whole Jewish people. The Jewish merchant-prince is constantly with the emperor, and nothing seems more probable than that the want of money on one side will suggest an offer on the other side to this effect:—"Prevail upon the Turkish government to make over the holy land to the Jews, and I will lend you so many millions, with or without security!" Such a bargain would be very natural under existing circumstances; and the Jews who are *already in the holy land* would then begin to take possession of their country; to restore their altars and sacrifices, and to rebuild their Temple at once, while others from all parts would join them from day to day. Were this to happen—were the holy land once given up to the Jews, a Protector would become essential to the security of the engagement. A powerful European ally would be absolutely necessary, in order to guarantee the land of Israel to those who were about to occupy it. This would suggest the idea of a treaty between the Jews and the protecting power for the mutual advantage of both, and then the "seven years' league" would be formed, as Daniel has foretold. There is nothing to prevent all this happening within the next few years, but a great deal to render it very probable at any time.

The league between the Jews and the Eighth Head, during the last week (or seven years) of Daniel, is not a new idea, but one which is familiar to all inquirers into prophecy; nor is it a new idea that the proper duration of Antichrist's supremacy will continue for the same period of seven years. * * * Having once broken loose in a career of conquests, he will never cease till he has made himself supreme over the whole of the Roman world, as well as over the representatives of all the other empires of Daniel. Chaldæa, Persia, Greece and Rome, are Daniel's four empires. And at this very day there is one man who is in possession of the *capitals* of *three* of those four kingdoms (for Chaldæa is subject to Constantinople,) and who has just formed an alliance with Persia, which has been followed by an immediate quarrel between the English Ambassador and the Persian court—a very suspicious coincidence!—Such a man as this must be under the strongest temptation to complete the work which he has so well begun. Finding the frame-work of the Roman empire securely in his hand, *a very few years* may be sufficient for maturing his preparations—and then he will go forth to fill up the outline, and to reconstitute the empire. He has this moment all the bones and cartilages of the Roman empire in his hands—he has got the SKELETON—he only requires now to fill it up with flesh and blood, and to breathe his own acute spirit into its nostrils, that it may become a living thing!—A very few years of preparation, and this may be done.

That the Roman empire shall be restored is a Scripture truth, and since it is to be restored, why not now? This subject is deserving of the deepest attention. This is no fiction or romance. The Word of God has foretold the resurrection of the fourth empire of Daniel. His word is enough, if the world were to deny the possibility. Sorry we

are to say that the people of this country have cast off God altogether. The nation that could not have made war even upon Russia without the help of two other nations fancies that it can set at defiance the decrees of God. But He has said the Roman empire should be revived—and He knows where to find the man. He has given to one man the frame-work of that empire—we all see it in his hands; and all the real work has been done within *two years*—since the beginning of 1854. In two or three years more what a work may be done?—what preparations may not be completed? and then the filling up of the frame-work may begin. Such an event is quite possible, since it is no more than a carrying out what has already been accomplished. He who has got so much without exciting the least suspicion or resistance may surely get much more without encountering any difficulty. And *then*, having gained all the strong places, and military positions of the empire, under the name of "peace," he may place himself at the head of his army and gain the rest of the empire under the name of "war." We have remarked in a former number the dexterity this man's manœuvres. He does not seize upon *territory*—that would create opposition. No; he gets quiet possession of the strong places—the capital cities—the *military points*. He can do this under various pretences, without exciting any suspicion; and well he knows that having got possession of the strong points and military positions, the rest will fall into his hands, as a matter of course, in due time. He knows well that the man who has got the apple tree will get the apples. So he seizes the apple tree early in the spring, that he may have the apples in the summer. Branch after branch, and root after root, he is getting the whole tree; and we are grown so decrepid through our love of *money making* that we have neither eyes to see, nor hands to prevent it. And it is most just in God to leave us to our infatuation; for the love of money in this nation has become a scandal not only to Christianity, but to human nature itself! It has eaten up every principle of good—in church and state—in public and in private life. It has proved itself, as Scripture has said, "the root of all evil;" and therefore God has permitted the money-grasping nation to be deluded and over-reached by the ambitious one. The greater criminal to be over-reached by the lesser. The love of conquest is bad, but the "love of money is the root of all evil," and therefore still worse. But one thing is certain,—that the restoration of the Roman empire is possible and inevitable, because God has foretold it; however, our politicians may fancy it to be visionary and impossible.

The possession of Italy and Jerusalem seems most likely to be the next object of the universal conspirator. He is manœuvring in both places at this moment. In Jerusalem, by laying claim to no less than eight of the holy shrines; and in Italy by uniting with Sardinia, and, under the appearance of promoting liberty, in reality fomenting a general revolution, both religious and political.—Of this revolution the Sardinian army from the Crimea is to form the advanced guard, being composed of men accustomed to actual war. With such an army as a vanguard, with a pretended hatred of Papal aggression, it will be easy for him to instigate a reaction against Austria, and, under the pretence of liberalism, to place his own ally, or his cousin, on the throne of Italy, as a preparation for seizing the kingdom of Italy himself. The servile concordat lately signed by Austria is particularly favorable to his views, for by contrasting his own liberalism with the servility of Austria he will attract all the hearts of Italy to his own side; and as for his present engagements to Popery we may be assured that he is only using them as a stepping stone to raise himself to power, and will then turn upon his master, destroy the Papal Church, and establish a new apostacy of his own. * * *

Whenever we shall see a great military leader re-establishing the Roman empire, we shall have positive proof that the end is at hand, and that the true Man of Sin is about to appear: for the 17th Revelation expressly attributes the *revival* of the Roman empire to the Eighth Head, who is identical with the Man of Sin. But the judgments of the last times begin with WAR. They are the first actings of the Eighth Head in re-establishing the Roman empire. Now observe the inference! If the career of Antichrist and the last judgments are to begin with *war*, it is then absolutely necessary that we should have the most profound peace *just before* those judgments begin. The judgments of God must always be DISTINCTIVE. The last war must be distinct from every other war. A war breaking out in the midst of a war would be just as indistinct as a fire in the midst of a fire.—Such a war would be no *new* or extraordinary thing; it would only be a continuation of what had existed before. Therefore it is necessary that they should begin after a profound *peace*. The same thing is made almost certain by various expressions of Scripture—for example—"Behold I come as a thief." "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night;"—all of which represent the world as in a state of sleep and security at the moment of the breaking forth of the final judgments. Can it be true that this present unexpected peace is the fore-runner? Is it but a moment of prosperity to put the world to sleep, that the Lord may come upon it as a thief in the night? Is it only a gleam of light to make the preceding darkness the more fearful? This is quite possible—perhaps certain. And if this be the case, what thoughts does it not suggest! One almost fears to express them—yet at all risks we will state what appears to be the most probable, without venturing upon any positive assertions.—It is this: We are now about to be cheated into a peace which will not secure a single object for which the war was undertaken; the ally whom we trusted forces *us* into peace because it suits himself. He will now (should peace be signed) form an alliance with Russia—keep her quiet for a while to mature his plans—and then, when everything is matured, go forth to re-establish the Roman empire, and begin the war. The world will be lulled to sleep by peace and commercial prosperity—by that detestable soporific the love of

trade—and will suddenly be awakened by a cry of war!—and that war the commencement of the last judgments of Christendom, and the kingdom of Antichrist. When "they say, 'peace and safety,' then sudden destruction shall come upon them, and they shall not escape."

The present crisis may, therefore, be most solemn! Peace—prosperity—security in the foreground—the world involved in speculations of boundless improvement. Man intoxicated with draughts of self applause. In a moment a new war breaks out, a new Cæsar arises in the West; the judgments of God accompany his career, and all the hopes of man are dashed to pieces—all the boasted religion of our enervated age subsides into the worship of Antichrist. We have long worshipped money only—it is an easy transition to bow down to the Man of Sin.

And what is the present aspect of Christendom? We will tell you. A thousand little groups and knots of little men; each with one central figure less diminutive than the rest. Each group collected around its chosen idol; each trusting to itself as the regenerator of the world, and every one of them turning its back on JESUS CHRIST, the King of kings, and leaving HIM to solitude and neglect. Such is Christendom, but "what will ye do in the end thereof?"

Will the Wicked Dead live Again?

"Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked to life?"

On an examination of the Holy Scriptures, we find that man, through disobedience, lost favor with God, and brought upon himself the just penalty of the law, which was to be death; positive, literal death. Death irrecoverable, had not God, in love, pity, and tender compassion, provided a way whereby he might be raised from the dead.—A way whereby he might be released from the power of the grave.

This provision the Scriptures denominate *salvation*. Luke 2: 30, 31. "For mine eyes have seen thy salvation which thou hast provided before the face of all people." Isa. 49: 6. "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth."

If any one is in doubt as to who, or what is brought to view in the foregoing passages, let them read them with their context. Now then, since God has done so much for man in providing so great salvation, at so great a cost, will he let a large portion of his created intelligences pass off into eternal silence, without acknowledging this salvation, or giving it a passing notice even?—This appears to be the question under controversy. Do the scriptures any where answer this important question? All will undoubtedly answer in the affirmative; that is, that the scriptures do answer the question. It would seem that a question of so great magnitude as the one under consideration would have been made so plain, that there would be no disagreement; yet there are some that affirm, and others that deny. It seems to me, that those who have taken the affirmative might have presented more scripture testimony than they have done. Does any one wish to know what, it is? Look at Isa. 45: 22, and 23. "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear." Query: is not the invitation in the 22d verse universal? does not, all ye ends of the earth mean all mankind? Again, does not the declaration under oath in the 22d cover the same ground that the invitation does in the 23d verse? So it would seem. How then we may inquire, is the every knee to bow, and the every tongue to swear, unless they be raised again to life from the dead? The apostle Paul in his quotation of the above passages, Rom. 14: 11; also Phil. 2: 10, 11, seems to construe them thus. That God has highly exalted the name of Jesus, and made him the medium through which this great salvation is to be obtained; swearing by himself that unto the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue should confess to him, (God.) Confess what?—That Jesus Christ is Lord. Confess this great salvation. But why this confession? Answer, to the glory of God the Father. We see then that God will not allow his glory to be eclipsed. He will not give his glory, or any part of it to the grave. No, no! they must confess Christ; and inasmuch as they never yet have done it, they must, consequently, be raised to life again in order to do it.

This view of the subject seems to harmonize with the sayings of Jesus Christ to the Jews, Math. 23: 37–39. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets," &c.; 39th verse, "For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." It will be observed that this was the last interview that Jeeus ever had with the Jews prior to his crucifixion. Although Jesus was seen by all the apostles, also by five hundred of the brethren after his resurrection, yet he was never seen by any of these whom he addressed in the foregoing declaration; but he gives them to understand that they will see him at some future time, and confess him to be the Christ: and be compelled to say, "blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord"; though they will not be benefitted by the confession.

Again, Luke 13: 28, Jesus addressed the same characters, "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and yourselves thrust out." Query: when have the persons thus addressed ever seen Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the prophets in the kingdom of God? or, when have they ever been thrust out of the kingdom? Never. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the prophets were dead anterior to the time of Christ's advent. More than that, the kingdom of God is yet in the future; and the scribes and pharisees, and doctors of the law are dead; consequently they must all be raised from the dead, or the saying of Jesus must fail, which can never be; for he says his word shall not pass away. I very well know that it may be said that

neither of the passages quoted in the foregoing remarks positively declare that the persons addressed shall be raised again to life from the dead; that is admitted; but then the passages quoted do declare that events shall take place, which, it seems to us any understanding mind must see never can take place without a resurrection to life and a state of consciousness.

How else can there be weeping and gnashing of teeth? how else can they say blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord? how else can they confess Jesus Christ to be Lord? How? how? Echo answers, *how?* W. A. M.

RESPONSE TO "W. A. M."—Br. M. at the outset, admits that "death *irrevocable*" was the fate of sinning men "had not God *in love, pity*, and tender compassion, provided a way whereby he might be released from the power of the grave." We are happy to be agreed with him in this sentiment. *It is truth.* Men, *all* men "*might* be released from the power of the grave"; but does it therefore follow that they all will be? We do not see it so. The release from the grave is the result of God's "*love, pity, and tender compassion.*" Will Br. M. say, the revival into life of those who die in their sins results from "love, pity, and tender compassion?" If so, and all the wicked dead are raised up to "acknowledge this salvation"—must not the same "love, pity, and tender compassion" give eternal life—or, at least a chance for it—to all thus made alive who had never heard the gospel proclaimed in *this life?*—Or are they to be condemned to die again because they did not "acknowledge this salvation" of which they had never heard?

Br. M. thinks the "*affirmative*" might have given "more scripture testimony than they have"; and he offers Isa. 45: 22, 13; he asks, "How is every knee to bow and every tongue to swear, unless they be raised again to *life* from the dead?"

We might ask, in turn, How God can say, "Look unto me and be ye saved all ye ends of the earth," if He never gives the wicked dead, if made alive, a chance to hear the call to "*look*" to Him and "be saved"? The fact is, God by the prophet Isaiah, was expostulating with men against their idolatry—their setting up "graven images" and praying to "a god that cannot save"; and He calls upon them to "*look unto*" Him; and directs all the ends of the earth—*i. e.* men everywhere—to turn from their idolatry and seek in Him the help they need. He then states a divine purpose, that the time shall come when idolatry shall be made to cease from the earth, and no other shall be acknowledged but himself as God. We conceive it has nothing to do with the wicked dead "acknowledging" to God.

The application the apostle makes of this text to Christ, Phil. 2: 10, 11, we regard as of the same import, *viz:* The time shall come when every living intelligence shall submit to the reign, or government of Christ. Dr. BLOOMFIELD, in his critical notes, says, "The words designate the *profound subjection* of all created to the supreme dignity of Jesus." Such, no doubt, is the truth; and the *Revelator* tells us, Rev. 5: 23, "Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the LAMB for ever and ever." Thus John saw the fulfillment of "every knee" bowing and "every tongue" confessing; but he neither saw nor heard the devil and his children bowing or confessing; and therefore we conclude that Isaiah nor Paul had any idea that the wicked dead were to be made alive to swell this song of holy beings.

Br. M. thinks the Jews, to whom Christ spoke, Math. 23: 37–39, "will see him at some future time, and confess him to be the Christ; and be compelled to say 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord'; though" he says, "they will not be benefitted by the confession." Now it happens, that Jesus' address was to "Jerusalem": of course, it relates to Jerusalem's children; and, as is apparent, is not confined to those *then living;* for it goes back to those who killed the prophets and stoned those sent unto them.—So also it goes forward to those who shall be alive when he comes again, and states a fact, *viz:* that those only should see him who were prepared to say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

The expression "*ye*" does not necessarily signify the identical persons addressed. The Saviour told his disciples—in speaking of the signs of his second coming—"when *ye* see these doings come to pass know it is nigh." Does Br. M. think the disciples will be made "*alive* from the dead" to see the signs which are to precede the resurrection itself? But there will be a class of Christ's followers who will be alive and see those signs, and they will constitute the "*ye.*" So there will be a class of Jerusalem's children—or of the Jews—who will constitute the *ye*, who shall say, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord"; and they *will* "be benefitted by the confession," just as certain as inspiration hath said—"if thou shalt

confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, *thou shalt be saved*": Rom. 10: 9. Br. M. says, they will *confess* him; and we think they will believe God raised him from the dead, and that without a doubt.

The same remarks are applicable to the expression "when *ye* see Abraham," &c. "in the Kingdom of God." It is a class of the Jews living at the time spoken of, *viz:* when that kingdom shall set up. Until it can be demonstrated that the law under which the Jews were placed, threatened a revival of the wicked dead into life, for any purpose, we have no right to *infer* such revival. There is no such threat in their law—no such thing can be found there; and therefore whatever the texts may mean that Br. M. relies on, in proof of the *affirmative*, they cannot mean that God will exceed—in punishing—the specifications of the law. "*How*" can God punish with such a terrible and horrible punishment, as that maintained by the affirmative, those who never heard of such a punishment, and whose law made no revelation of it? "How? *how*? Echo answers, HOW?"

Lazarus in Abraham's Bosom.

FROM Z. CAMPBELL.

Bro. Storrs:—Once more I would call attention to the parable of the Rich man and Lazarus: not with intention to give a new exposition of it, for I am satisfied that the two leading characters represent Jew and Gentile. The Jew, after the expiration of his ecclesiastical life-time: dead and buried; the Gentile, after the expiration of his pagan life-time, dead; but unburied, and just entering on his new and ecclesiastical life-time.

Admitting this, the condition of Lazarus could not be better represented than by being in "Abraham's bosom."

And it should be borne in mind, that he was not in Moses' bosom. This would bring him under the law and under the Sinai covenant which "gendereth to bondage." And also, since the law could not give life, Lazarus could not live in the bosom of Moses. But we find him in Abraham's bosom: and the question is, what covenant does that bring him under? Evidently, under the Abrahamic, which was four hundred and thirty years before the law, which was added by reason of transgression. This covenant, unlike the Sinaic, gendereth to life: for the promise to Abraham was that he should possess the land forever; and yet that he should die in a good old age: and he died in faith not having received the things promised, but having seen them afar off, was persuaded of them; that is, hoped for them through a resurrection to life. This is, therefore, the only covenant that genders to life. But some will say, Is not life promised in the gospel covenant? Yes, truly: but we come under the gospel covenant only by being in Abraham's bosom. "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen, through faith, preached before (four hundred and thirty years before the law) the gospel to Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed."

The Abrahamic covenant is, therefore, the gospel covenant which genders to life, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Now the promise was made to Abraham and his natural children, and such of them as depart from the faith are broken off from the promise: and such of the Gentiles as embrace the faith, are grafted in. Into what? not into the bosom of Moses; but into the bosom of Abraham; into the *good olive tree*. This tree, as we have seen, is four hundred and thirty years older than Moses' burning bush; and must exist, a living tree, (Jesus Christ, himself also a Jew, and the life of it,) as long, at least, as there is a Gentile to be grafted in.

We are not grafted into the dead and broken off branches, but into a living tree: and even these dead branches, if they abide not in unbelief, may be grafted into their *own* olive tree. But the poor Gentile *has* no olive tree of his own, but is made wholly dependent on his despised Jewish brethren for life, there being no other living stock for him to be grafted into. It is, therefore, a clear case, that "salvation is of the Jews"; and not of the Gentiles.

What need is there then, for those Jews who have not departed from the faith of Abraham, not been broken off, of being grafted in? indeed, they cannot be grafted in, until they are broken off.—Their case is very different from Gentiles, these are not by nature in the good olive tree; but are cut out of the wild olive tree and grafted into the good one. But some will say, all the Jews are broken off: but the Scripture does not say so: Paul says *some*, only, of the branches are broken off, not all of them. And Simeon said—"This child (Christ) is set for the fall, and rise again of many in Israel." *Some* and *many* are far from being all. I know it is generally believed that all the Jews are broken off; but it is difficult to see how they are broken off from the Abrahamic promise. Paul says—"And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: Unto which promise our twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night hope to come." If these twelve tribes are all broken off, I see no reason why Paul is not broken off too; for he was of the tribe of Benjamin, and he, and the twelve tribes had one and the same hope, and of course the same faith. The Jews still hope for the promise of God unto the fathers, and to be restored to their land under the reign of the Messiah, and in this respect, they are in the *true faith*, much more so than most Christians. In denying that Jesus is the Christ, they do not deny the Abrahamic faith, or lose sight of the promise.—What then are they broken off from? Not from Christ, for they were never in Christ the Son of Mary. They have all the faith in Messiah, that is in the Messiahship that Abraham had, and much

more than Christians generally, but they deny the man.

Now to convert them all to Gentile Christianity would be to cut them out of their own good olive tree, and graft them into the wild olive tree, and make the Scripture read—"Salvation is of the Gentiles." They have set at naught their legal King, and are suffering the bitter consequence. They will not see him again until they shall say—"Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The spirit of prayer and of supplication will then be poured upon them, and they will look on him whom they have pierced; and mourn because of him, as one mourneth for his only son. When they see him in glory, their expectations will be realized, and they will worship him: for "In his day Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely."

The very common objection, that God could not be just in giving the Jews two chances of salvation and Gentiles but one, has no force in it.—Neither Jew or Gentile ever had but one, and never will have. The only chance for the Jew is in his own olive tree, the Abrahamic tree. He had no chance of salvation by the law, for that could not give life, else righteousness had been by the law: and Lazarus would have been carried, by angels, to the bosom of Moses instead of Abraham. If a Jew be broken off of that tree, he has no hope of life until he is grafted in again; and the Gentile has none until *he* is grafted into the same tree.

It does not follow that the Jews, in denying Christ departed from the Abrahamic faith; for they still continue in that faith. From what has been said, it will appear that both Jew and Gentile are under the Abrahamic covenant, such as are under any: the Jew by being a son of Abraham: and the Gentile by the promise to Abraham extended to him by faith.

But it may be said, this being the case, that the Rich Man ought also to have been represented in Abraham's bosom along with Lazarus. And indeed the Rich Man and Lazarus were both the sons of Abraham, the former a natural son, and the latter an adopted son. And since "the law and the prophets were until John; and since that time the kingdom of heaven is preached, and every man presseth against it;" it is evident the force and virtue of the law died, and like Moses, was buried and the Rich Man with it, who had sinned in the law and perished by it. And that he was under the influence of the law, while dead, is evident from the fact Abraham said to him, concerning his brethren—"They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." Therefore, the Law-children, while dead cannot be in Abraham's bosom, but in the bosom of the dead Moses, and cannot live again until Moses lives again, and that will be when the law will go forth from Mount Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

"The Prayer of King Henry VIII. in Hell."—A Brother writes us as follows, on that subject:

"When I read the 'prayer of King Henry VIII, in Hell,' from your unknown correspondent, and your own remarks added, the thought struck me that you had misapprehended his design. Allow me to suggest an idea in relation to it.

"I take it that the one who sent the prayer, and notice of the 'Lectures,' is an 'outsider' who sympathizes with you in views; and the prayer is a '*fancy*' touch designed as a sarcasm on the 'Theological' *moral depravity of infants*, and the *hell* of Bush, Barrett, Beswick & Co. And it is really a rich one, whether designed or not. Look at it again in the light of this suggestion and see if it does not appear so."

"As a sarcasm on the" common notion of "moral depravity" our readers can all judge of its fitness. We have our reasons for believing the person who sent it meant it as a "sarcasm" on our views of the utter extermination of the wicked.—We recognized the hand-writing as the same as that of a communication we received some two years ago: a most rabid defence of the immortality and eternal torture of the wicked. As we took no notice of his previous article, we judged he meant to strengthen it by a *fable*. This *fable* certainly has more common sense in it than any article we ever saw in defence of endless sin and suffering; for it shows that some men in "hell" have a very clear sense of the *injustice* done them by the infliction of endless sufferings. Hence it proves the falsehood of the oft repeated assertion that "the sinner in hell will see the *justice* of God in his damnation"; for King Henry—as the fable goes—thought it very *unjust* to keep him in torments while he acknowledged it would be right "to take away" his "being." Thus, whether men appeal to the Bible or to fables in defence of endless sin and sufferings, they show themselves incapable of making either harmonize with the common sense of rational beings relating to such a visitation.

Defence *of A. C. Locke, Stephen Field, and David Graffam;* excluded from the Free-Will Baptist Church, at Lewiston Falls, Me., March 12th, 1855."

We have received a pamphlet of 24 pages with the foregoing title. The said Church in excluding these brethren make the following statement, *viz:*

"Believing it to be wrong to retain in church fellowship those who believe and advocate doctrines opposed to the established faith of the F. W. B. Church, as the tendencies of such an union is to promote strife and discord, rather than the furtherance of the cause of God.

"Therefore as certain brethren, to wit: Bros. A. C. Locke, Stephen Field and David Graffam,

avow that they believe and claim to advocate that man hath no immortal soul—that he dies as the beast dies, and that there is nothing of him that is conscious until the resurrection, and that the wicked are annihilated, or that they do not continue in a conscious state of punishment; the promulgation of which, the church believes ought not to be countenanced.

"We therefore feel in duty bound to withdraw the hand of church fellowship from the aforesaid brethren, and declare them no longer members of the church.

"And at the same time we would assure said brethren that it is alone in consequence of their belief and advocacy of such as we believe erroneous doctrines, that we feel that the cause of God demands us to take this step, and our prayer is that they may see their error and renounce it, and then it shall give us joy to receive them again, as it now gives us pain to part with them."

The brethren excluded ought to be thankful that the Lord has brought them out so easy from a *bound*-"will" church; and we hope they will see to it that their connection hereafter shall be *only* with the *Church of Christ*, of which they are members by virtue of their *union* with him.—Let there be no *rival* allowed to share the honor of a membership in the "*Church of God*." The Lord's children are *free;* having been made so by His Son. If they get entangled in *bound-will* churches, it is a mercy for them to be thrown out.

These brethren have vindicated themselves and the doctrines they hold in a candid and Christian spirit; and their exclusion from the "F. W. B. C." will, we doubt not, be over-ruled for good to them and for the furtherance of the truths they advocate. "In your patience possess ye your souls."

BOOKS, ETCÆTERA.

THE only works we keep for sale are the following:—

"SIX SERMONS," *Revised and Enlarged*—Those who have read this work, have found very much matter not in the *Original*; besides an entire new sermon on "*Christ the Life-Giver*." In addition to this, it is printed with a large clear type, thus affording much more satisfaction in reading. *Price* in plain binding, 63 cents: in gilt $1. We will put 8 copies for $3, cash.

DOBNEY ABRIDGED.—This is part 2d of Dobney's work on "Future Punishment," and contains his *entire* argument on the *nature* of that punishment; showing it to be literal *death*, and not endless torment. Price 38 cents. By the quantity, we put *five* copies for $1, cash.

"BIBLE *vs.* TRADITION."—This invaluable work should have a wider circulation. Price 75 cents, bound; 50 cents in paper covers. By the dozen, bound, $5: in paper covers, *ten* copies for $3, cash.

"DISCUSSION" with Prof. MATTISON. Price 50 cts. bound: 25 in paper covers.

"UNITY OF MAN," or "Review of *Luther Lee* on the Soul." Price 12 cents.

"OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN."—We have procured a few *bound* copies of this work. Price 75 cents.

Any of the foregoing works, when the *retail* price is sent, we will send free of postage. When ordered by the quantity, the purchaser pays the freight, or postage, himself.

"ANALYTICAL INVESTIGATION *Concerning the Credibility of the Scriptures*," &c. by DR. MCCULLOH. Price $2. Fifty cents additional if *we* pay the postage.

Again we say—We keep no *Tracts* of any description, except "*Prof. Park's Test of Faith*," and we are out of that just now.

The fact is, we have no funds to print tracts.—If the friends wish us to keep them they must devise some means to meet the expense. With a fund of two hundred dollars we might keep an assortment of them; as it is, we cannot. We have no wish to have the burthen of it upon us even if we had the funds. We have enough to get along with our books above named, and the EXAMINER: all that we think duty requires us to do.

ANOTHER CHANGE has become necessary in our *address*. The losses our friends and ourself have been subjected to, recently, from Post Office mismanagement, or some other cause, compels us to try one more expedient to avoid them. Hereafter let all—without alteration, or anything else added—direct *exactly* as follows:

GEO. STORRS,
Box 4658,
NEW YORK.

All money sent for BIBLE EXAMINER, directed as above, is at *our risk*. Sent for *Books*, it is at the *risk of the purchaser*.

DR. MCALLISTER—at whose store we call in New York—has removed from 141, across the way to 148 Fulton St. Let our friends who *call* for their papers observe this; and others also who wish to leave any business there for us.

MERIDEN CONN.—Our paper goes to press before its date; and as it will reach some before April 27th, we insert this note to let our friends know, in the vicinity of *Meriden*, that we expect to spend the 27th to 29th of April at that place, and Lecture on the *Life Theme* during those *three days*. We go there by special request of friends in that place.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK. MAY 15, 1856. NO. 10.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SPIRIT.

"But there is a spirit in man."—Job. xxxii. 8.

To DETERMINE the import of the term Spirit under every variety of circumstance in which it may be used in the Sacred Writings, is a task which neither our space nor our design warrant us to undertake.

Treatises commensurate with such a view of the subject already exist, and by a reference to these the reader can easily satisfy himself on those points which lie beyond the limits of the following remarks. Our present object is very simple, and concerns merely the question—*What is the Spirit of Man?* In answering which we are desirous of echoing only the testimony of Scripture, whose verdict we feel bound to regard as forever decisive.

And, as the language of our text is at once positive and direct, we would respectfully submit what appears to us its fair and natural meaning; a meaning we presume, in strict harmony with the universal deliverance of both the Old and New Testament.

The statement reads: "But there is a spirit in Man."

Now, the first thing which strikes us here is the evident distinction between the *Spirit* and the *Man*. To this distinction we wish particularly to call attention, inasmuch as the theory about the human spirit which now floats in the mind of Christendom, is borne up solely through an obstinate disregard of this plain Scripture fact.

This will at once appear if we attend for a moment to the difference between the assertion that Man *is* a Spirit, or spiritual being; and the assertion that man *has* a spirit, a something which while performing an essential function in his constitution, is not to be regarded as a distinct entity, according to the prevailing notion.

The former of these propositions, it will be seen, is plainly negatived by the latter: and as the proof of the one must necessarily be the refutation of the other, we will briefly adduce what seems to us clear and decided evidence in support of the proposition, which affirms, that *the spirit in man is only an attribute of his physical organism, and is in no respect to be regarded as capable of a separate and independent conscious existence.*

And here the term itself claims primary attention. The word Spirit, which, whatever may be the sense attached to it in actual usage, is the English equivalent for the Hebrew *ruach*, and the Greek *pneuma*, both of which, according to lexicographers, radically import *breath*. The term is used in a variety of senses throughout Scripture, but in every case, except when intended as a metaphor, when spoken of *Man*, it is to be held simply as a synonyme for *breath*.

The primary relation which this breath or spirit sustains to man is not intimated in the text, but as both the philosophy and the facts of human existence demonstrate this, we have only to reflect on the state of man when bereft of his breathing powers, or, as orthodox conventionalism would have it, "when his spirit has departed," in order to ascertain the exact nature of the union. Immediately breathing ceases, life is at an end, and all mental and moral faculties at once paralyzed. The function, then, of the breath, or spirit in man, is no other than the maintenance of life, his deprivation of it producing the phenomenon we call *death*, which we hesitate not to pronounce complete in relation to all that constituted the sentient being.

Hence seems to have originated the phrase, "breath of life,"—breathing, or the inspiration of the electrified air by the lungs, being essential to the life of all flesh (Gen. vi. 17.)

This being the case, it is certainly not stretching language too far to speak of the breath or spirit as the "vital principle," or life-sustaining power, life being connected with the performance of its functions in the human system.

This will help to account for that class of passages where "spirit," which as above defined, literally denotes *breath*, is spoken of as *the life itself*, and sometimes even as equivalent to the *whole man;* Man being regarded as consisting of "Soul, Body, and Spirit," or, more simply, as an organized being, kept alive by breathing, the withdrawal of which breath or spirit, resulting in nothing less than the total dissolution or annihilation of his conscious being. Hence Elihu, "If he (the Almighty) set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to dust" (Job. xxxiv. 14 15.) And again the Psalmist, "His (man's) breath (or *spirit*) goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish" (Ps. cxlvi. 4.) So also Solomon, "Then (*at death*) shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit (*or breath*) unto God who gave it" (Ecc. xii. 7.)

This view of the spirit of man may appear to

some as inconsistent with such passages as ascribe to it *personality* and *intelligent* attributes.

To this we can only make the general reply, that though at first sight, inconsistent with *some* of the language employed, a careful examination of the real import of terms will satisfy any impartial reader whose mind has not been wholly "spoiled through philosophy and vain deceit," that neither personality nor intelligence are to be attributed to the human spirit; but, rather, that the "spirit in man" being the principle or power through whose agency, in connection with the mechanical parts of the human organism, intelligence is produced and identity or personality, maintained, they are *rhetorically* predicated of the Spirit itself.

This is clearly established by the fact, that in numerous instances personality, and intelligence are alike referred to Soul, Body, and Spirit; as "*my* Soul," "*my* Flesh," "my Spirit;" so that if it be contended that the "*my*" in cases where *spirit* is intended, proves its distinct intelligence and separate identity, then, on the same ground, we are authorized to maintain the essential personality and intelligence of Soul and Body; and Man, instead of being a simple self conscious unity, is to be regarded as a *triune compound of consciousness;* which is only in other words to say, that man is three distinct persons—an hypothesis at once unphilosophical, irrational and unscriptural.

From all, then, which we can discover from the Book, we think we may safely presume that the "spirit in man" and the work it performs in his constitution, while indispensable to his existence and development, is no more independent of the laws which regulate this physical organism, than the liver which secretes bile, or the heart which propels the blood through his veins.

At this conclusion, we can imagine many "orthodox believers" to start back in absolute despair, while the acclamations "infidelity" and "atheism" sound forth the pious horror which possess them at the thought, which divests man's nature of that mysterious and God-like principle, of which his future existence is supposed only to be predicable.

To such we would say,—pause, and reflect.—The truth is even as we have said. But then—what then? Certainly not despair! Not Infidelity! Not Atheism! Nay! If infidelity or atheism exist, it is all on the other side. For what is our position? Why, this, That the popular grounds on which the hopes of futurity are reared, are altogether false and unscriptural!

Yea, and further, that till the delusion is dispelled, the mass of professed believers are without the shadow of evidence that there shall be any future state at all.

Platonic,—or may we not rather say Satanic?—argument, endorsing the "immortality of the Soul" or the "Indestructibility of Spirit" may be adduced (Gen. iii. 4, 5); but beyond this, the creeds of Christendom at present think it not expedient to pass.

Infidelity forsooth! Yes, 'tis, alas! too potent to be denied, for, what with Immortal Soul and Spirit-ism, and other kindred creations of the pagan mind, Bible testimony is hushed—her august deliverances on the nature and destiny of Man silenced, and the groundless speculations of "divines" substituted in their room.

But this must end. The Bible is struggling to be heard again; and to aid her emancipation from the thraldom of the bigotry and intolerance under which she has been groaning during these centuries of darkness and superstition, we would here echo her voice on behalf of a mortal and death-doomed race—by announcing RESURRECTION and LIFE, as Heaven's one grand pledge for the redemption of humanity,—when, from the dark confines of oblivion the conqueror of Hades shall summon the candidates for

"GLORY, HONOR, AND IMMORTALITY!"

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

[From "Credibility of the Scriptures."]

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

BY J. H. M'CULLOH, M. D., BALTIMORE.

(Continued from p. 100.)

Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians was composed about A. D. 61, or *twenty eight years* after Christ had given his last instructions to his apostles.—This letter is addressed to the whole congregation at Ephesus, who were converted Gentiles. Among the various matters of doctrinal instruction communicated to them, Paul intermingles other matters that concerned them as a mere congregation of believers in the gospel. Thus he reminds them (chap. iv. 7–12) "that *unto every one of us* is given grace according to the measure (*i. e.*) nature or kind) *of the gift of Christ.* And he gave some (*i. e.*) qualified them to be) *apostles* and some *prophets*, and some *evangelists*, and some *pastors and teachers*, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," &c. But he says not a word concerning bishops, presbyters, and deacons, which is totally irreconcilable with the hypothesis that these were then the divinely constituted officers of the church. This omission to enumerate them is still more striking in the fact, that he specially reminds *husbands, wives, parents, children, masters and servants*, of their relative duties to each other. The inferences to be thus deduced are therefore directly conclusive against the supposition of any clerical organization in the church at this time as a divine institution.

The Epistle to the Philippians, written about A. D. 62 or 63, *i. e.* about thirty years after our Saviour's ascension was sent in the conjoined names of Paul and Timothy, to the congregation at Philippi, together with "*the bishops* (episcopoi) *and deacons.*" This epistle stands alone in this address as specifying the bishops or deacons, and even in that particular it is to be remarked that except the bare mention of them in the first salutation there is no farther notice taken of them, and not the most distant allusion is made concerning their office or functions. If the apostle had con-

sidered them to be ministers of Christ set apart by a divine institution as the spiritual governors of the church at Philippi, it is utterly inconceivable why he should have omitted either to exhort them to the discharge of their divine functions, or to have instructed the people that they should reverence them in their divine commissions. But as nothing has been said by the apostles on these particulars, we can only regard the terms "bishops and deacons" to have been applied to the heads or leaders of the Christian community at Philippi, in the consuetudinary phrase of the times, as significant of their mere position as the leaders or officers of a prayer-meeting, and not as being so from any divine appointment. The omission to mention any divine body of clergy, if such existed at Philippi, is the more remarkable, as Paul was so attentive to minute things as to send an apostolic exhortation (chap. iv. 2) to two women in this congregation who had some misunderstanding between them, and to *"beseech them to be of the same mind."* He also entreats some person or other among them by the term of *"true yoke fellow,"* to help *those women which labored with me in the gospel,* (*i. e.* who had assisted him in its propagation) with Clement also, and with other of my fellow laborers whose names are in the book of life.

That the apostle after this close attention to the concerns of individuals, should entirely omit to say something either direct or indirect upon so important a matter as a divinely appointed clergy, if such had been established at the time, I apprehend is conclusive that no such institution existed.

We may further remark on the present occasion, that be the office or functions of bishop (episcopoi) and deacons what they may, it is evident from the salutation given them in the first chapter that bishops (episcopoi) and presbyters (presbuteroi) are synonymous, for it is not *bishop* in the singular number, but in the plural as signifying several.—The passage therefore as such is an argument against the episcopal hypothesis which implies always only one bishop to a diocese, and not several in one congregation. Nothing however is more evident than that the terms bishop and presbyter or elder are used synonymously throughout the New Testament. Not only are the terms used convertibly in the same chapters, but we never find them used distinctly; that is to say, mention is made of bishops and deacons, or of presbyters and deacons; but there is not a single passage in the New Testament that speaks of bishops, elders and deacons conjointly, thus affording the clearest evidence, that let their situation be what it may, there were only two classes of officers or leaders recognized in the church during the times of the apostles.

The Epistle to the Colossians was sent in the name of Paul and Timothy to the Christians at Colosse about A. D. 62, *i. e.* about thirty years after Christ had his last interview with his apostles, when our clergy suppose he gave them full instructions concerning the future constitution of the church.

In this epistle, which is formally addressed to the whole congregation, there is no salutation made to any supposed ecclesiastical authorities: but mention is made in chap. i. 7 of "Epaphras our dear fellow servant, who is for you a *faithful minister of Christ.*" The word minister is the translation of the Greek word *diakonos* which may be either *deacon* in the ecclesiastical, or *minister or servant* in an ordinary sense, for Paul, in the twenty-third and twenty-fifth verses of this same chapter says of himself, "whereof I, Paul, am made a minister," *diakonos.* Now certainly as the apostle did not mean to say that he was technically speaking *a deacon,* we have no reason whatever to regard Epaphras in any other light than a leader or minister in a lay prayer-meeting.

In the conclusion of the epistle, Paul gives advice specially to wives, husbands, children, fathers, masters, servants, as to their relative duties; and then to sundry individuals, among others "Nymphas and the *church,* (*ekkleesian i. e.* the congregation) which is in his house," which we have no reason to suppose had any organization other than a prayer-meeting. A special caution is also addressed to a person of the name of Archippus, "Take heed to the *ministry* (*diakonian*) which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it. As we have already spoken of this term it is unnecessary to say any thing further on the subject. The application of it to the leader of a prayer or class-meeting, is *prima facie,* just as reasonable as to assume it designates a member of the clerical body. Which hypothesis is the more consistent with the general statement made in the Scripture the reader can determine for himself.

Paul's Epistle to Philemon, though a mere private letter to an individual, still affords us some inferences that tend to confirm our general views of the condition of Christian society in the apostolic age. This Epistle, supposed to have been written about A. D. 62, was addressed to a citizen of Colosse by the name of Philemon, and a female called Apphia, presumably his wife, and also to the "*church in thy house.*"

In this recognition of a church in a private house, and no mention being made of any divinely constituted church officer, I apprehend we have no reason to consider it otherwise than an assembly of Christians united together on the principle of either a lay prayer-meeting or that of a Methodist class. Such an inference is consistent with the language of the Epistle, and which offers no justification for regarding it as a church constituted on ecclesiastical principles.

The conclusion of the Epistle also exhibits Paul's opinion respecting those individuals who ordinarily were associated with him, "There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus, Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, *my fellow laborers.*"

The next epistle of Paul in chronological order, is the First Epistle to Timothy, which is commonly supposed to have been written about A. D. 64, *i. e.* about thirty-one years after the ascension of Christ to heaven.

Timothy was a disciple of Paul's whom he had converted at Derbe or Lystra, (*Acts* xxi. i. &c.) about A. D. 53. He afterwards attended Paul in itinerant journeys as an assistant minister, and is

associated with him in many of his addresses to various Christian communities. This was giving a very high position to Timothy in the estimation of the Christian world, but more especially so with the immediate converts made by Paul. There is not, however, the smallest authority in the New Testament to regard Timothy in any other light than as one of the confidential associates of Paul, who as being fully instructed in the doctrines preached by him, was therefore qualified to carry on the ministry of the gospel in those places where Paul had not leisure to mature the system of things he may have commenced. The advocates of diocesan episcopacy have labored hard to establish the belief that Timothy was addressed by Paul in this epistle as a bishop in their sense of the term, but for this opinion there is not the least authority as we shall presently shew.

The First Epistle to Timothy is from Paul, who going on to Macedonia requested him to remain at Ephesus, purposing to return again as is implied by chap. iv. 13, "Till I come," &c. and to enforce among the Christians of that city the doctrines that had been previously inculcated by Paul. Some confusion and distraction had evidently arisen among them in consequence of disputes among the religious leaders or instructors of the people, for Paul in chap. i : 6, 7, says, "some having swerved, have turned aside unto vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law, (*i. e.* of Moses) understanding neither what they say nor whereof they affirm." I think we may safely presume that these teachers could not have been a legally constituted ministry, otherwise Paul would have directed them to be silenced or suspended, but as nothing of this kind is suggested to Timothy, it follows that these false teachers were laymen. But then again our argument is equally cogent against the existence of a divinely constituted clergy at Ephesus, if we consider these "*janglers*" to have been laymen, for the inference is direct that if there had been any clerical body at Ephesus, the apostle would have referred to them as persons properly ordained to teach what was the truth in contradistinction to the *janglers*, and thus put an end to the confusion. Paul, however, makes no such reference, neither does he give any ecclesiastical authority to Timothy to silence such persons; he simply instructs him to counteract false teachers by preaching the doctrines that Paul had taught him.

In further evidence against the supposition that there was any ecclesiastical organization of clergy at Ephesus at this time, I remark that Paul says, chap. ii. 12, "*I suffer not a woman to teach*." The apostle speaks in the singular number, "*I Paul* do not suffer a woman to teach," &c. Now had there been any ecclesiastical organization of clergymen established either by Christ or the Apostles prior to this time, would Paul have used such a phrase? Did not the emergency require him to have said, "*We the apostles by the appointment af Christ do not suffer, i. e.* do not allow a woman to preach? But instead of such an observation, Paul's argument against women undertaking to teach, is deduced from the mere natural inferiority of the woman to the man, nor does he give the slightest hint that there was any breach of ecclesiastical ordinance by this impropriety. Neither is it impertinent to add that it is utterly incredible the people of Ephesus thirty years after the ascension of Christ, should be so ignorant of the true constitution of the Christian church as not to know that women ought not to teach, had any form of church organization been previously established among them by apostolic authority.

In chap. iii. the apostle gives Timothy some instructions concerning the general moral qualifications of those who should be selected for the office of *bishop*, (episcopos) which it is no longer controverted is here used synonymously for *elder or presbyter*. Again, with the *deacons*, they are to be selected for their moral qualities, but not one word is said either as to bishops or deacons becoming members of an ecclesiastical corporation in virtue of their ordination, which I cannot understand why the apostle should have forborne to mention if he had recognized any such institution: for the occasion manifestly required it, whether as calling the attention of the bishops and deacons to their official responsibility, or as instructing the people as to the fact, that these persons held their appointment under the sanction of a divine commission.

There is, however, a very important ommission in our English Bibles, in the enumeration of the persons whom Timothy was instructed by Paul *to ordain*, which is but slightly noticed by commentators, and is universally disregarded by those persons who have been engaged in controversies on the subject of the clerical organization of the Christian church. I therefore request the particular attention of the reader to the 11th verse of the above chapter, which I shall quote as printed in our common translation as shewing the supplied words, (*in italics*,) which our translators have added to the text. "Even so *must their* wives," (*i. e.* the wives of the deacons,) "be grave not slanderous, sober, faithful in all things."

By having rendered the Greek word (*gunaikas*) *wives*, which is only one sense of that word, and by having inserted the relative pronoun *their*, our translators have represented the apostle to merely admonish the *wives of the deacons* as to the propriety of their external conduct.

The Vulgate translates the Greek word by *mulieres*, which is literally rendered by the Douay translators, *women*, by which they evidently intended to imply that the exhortation of the apostle was addressed generally to *all women* professing Christianity.

But though these translators, both Catholic and Protestant, have availed themselves of the ambiguity of the Greek term, which in that language as well as in the Hebrew, French, &c. is used indifferently to imply either a *wife* or *a woman* in the general sense; yet there can be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man acquainted with ecclesiastical antiquities, that the apostle meant neither *wife nor woman*, but used the terms in an adjective sense as designating those female officers known in the primative church as *deaconesses*. As the correct appreciation of this fact is of the greatest importance towards estimating the true eccle-

siastical character of those persons mentioned in the New Testament as bishops or presbyters, and deacons, we shall more particularly investigate the meaning of the above mentioned verse as well as illustrate it by some information respecting the deaconesses in primative times, of whom little is known at present by the ordinary readers of the New Testament.

The observations of Dr. Bloomfield, a very learned clergyman of the church of England, on the meaning of the word *gunaikas* in 1st *Tim.* iii. 11, are sufficiently full for the most part as shewing the sense of the passage, I therefore shall quote his *Recensio Synoptica* viii. 239, which is further strengthened by the various authorities referred to by him.

"On what we are to understand by *gunaikes*, commentors are not agreed. Most modern ones thinks *the wives of deacons* are meant. But to this it is with reason objected, that if so, it is strange nothing should have been said of the duties of *bishop's wives*, which were yet of greater consequence. I therefore agree with the ancients, (commentators,) and of the moderns, Menochius, Grotius, Benson, Hardy, Macknight, Valpy, &c., that we are here to understand *deaconesses;* an order mentioned at *Romans* xvi. 1, and (as Theophylact observes) very useful and necessary to the church. If (adds he) these were not meant, why should any mention have been introduced of women among what was said of deacons? Besides I would add, the very epithets *semnas, grave, neephalious, sober, me diabolous* not slanderers, and *pistons* faithful, (two of which are applied to the bishops,) seem far more suitable to *deaconesses, than deacon's wives.* Assuredly the *usus loquendi* permits the word to be taken as well of *women* (*i. e.* deaconesses) as *wives.* And the argument that the apostle would have expressed his meaning more clearly is in a writer like St. Paul of little weight. Others object that these (the deaconesses) are mentioned at *chap.* v. but they are there only *alluded to.* And surely in a question like this, *the united voice of early antiquity* founded on tradition or ancient written information unknown to us, carries with it authority which it were unwise to reject."

A more common book however, Macknight on the epistles, (*Romans* xvi. 1 and 2, and 1st *Tim.* iii. 11,) will give the reader a good general view of the sense of the above verses as well as concerning the office of the deaconess.

But in order to obtain a more perfect comprehension of the apostolic institution of the deaconesses, it will be necessary to look a little further into this epistle to Timothy, for we shall find in an ensuing chapter, that it gives us ample information as to the fact of the official position of the deaconesses in the Christian congregations which Timothy was directed to organize. Paul after having spoken in the third chapter of bishops, deacons, and as we have shewn also of *deaconesses* as official persons in Christian congregations, then digresses, as is not unusual with him on other occasions. In the fifth chapter he returns to the subject concerning the deaconesses, and enlarges on it in such manner as is equivalent to a formal recognition of their official character. He however there speaks of them by the synonymous term *widow*, which was perfectly well recognized as such by the early ecclesiastical writers.

In this discourse however, he speaks of *widows* in a two-fold manner, one of which is in the ordinary sense, and the other as an office in the congregation. There is no difficulty however in separating them from each other.

Of widows in the ordinary sense, as being desolate and requiring consolation and assistance, Paul speaks in 1st *Tim.* v. 3–8 verses inclusive. He then speaks of widows in the official sense from the ninth to the fifteenth verses. And in the sixteenth verse he again speaks of them in the ordinary sense of the term.

It is easy to shew this differences. In the ninth verse he objects to any widow being registered (*i. e.* as a deaconess) under sixty years of age. It is evidently impossible he could have made such a limitation respecting desolate or necessitous widows, for christian benevolence is necessarily to be extended to all such whether young or old. Hence Paul's ensuing remarks distinctly shew, that in specifying the period of sixty years, it was to be regarded only in an official sense as a qualification for a deaconess. For after having enumerated in the tenth verse, not the necessities, but the moral qualifications of those who were to be received as widows, (deaconesses) he then adds in the eleventh verse, "but the younger widows refuse," &c. Paul's argument is evidently that they were not to be trusted as *deaconesses*, for if an advantageous match was proposed to them by a heathen, that that they would marry him, and thus bring reproach upon the Christian name by their lapse from an official position in the congregation.

In addition to this he also mentions the further disqualification, that the younger portion of the sex were predisposed to running about, tattling, gossiping, &c. On these various considerations Paul therefore directed that only elderly females of sixty years of age, should be received as widows, (deaconesses.) As for the younger *widows*, as the context evidently requires, and not *women* as in our translation, Paul says I will that they marry or re-marry as Christian women, and live irreprochable.

That the term *widow* was often used as a synonyme for *deaconess*, a reference to *Bingham's Antiq. Christ. Church*, &c. or any other copious history of the primitive church, will fully satisfy the readers as to that fact.

The recognition of the deaconesses as officers of the church by an apostolic ordination, wholly destroys all that false analogy so largely insisted upon by certain Christian ministers of the gospel, as existing between them and the several orders of the Jewish hierarchy. This doctrine gradually elaborated in the corruptions of the third century, as gradually induced by the clergy to get rid of the deaconesses, which they at last accomplished by reducing them to the condition of the various subordinate official appointments that were multiplied in the church at a latter time.

Mind and Matter.]

The question, Can mind exist independent of matter? is one that has elicited much controversy: and one which we conceive, when viewed in the light of the popular conflicting theories is in itself an *absurdity*. For the materialist to propound such a question is absurd, because his theory assumes that mind and matter are identical.—The question then when viewed in the light of this theory, would be,—Can MATTER exist independent of *matter*? or, in other words, a palpable absurdity. So likewise with the opposite theorist who maintains, that mind is immortal! to substantiate which they are compelled to assume that mind is an entity, or in other words, is substantial; or matter. The question, then, viewed in the light of this latter theory resolves itself (as in the former) into the same absurdity, namely, "can substance, or matter, exist independent of matter?" This plain and comprehensive view of these two apparently opposing theories divulges the reason why these, (when brought into antagonism on the question at issue) have never been able satisfactorily to settle this much mooted question, simply because they were attempting to maintain like positions, whilst, at the same time, they were presumed to be opposite issues. We object then to the materialists' theory, because in assuming that mind is the offspring of matter he virtually maintains that mind is matter; for we can have no conception of matter producing anything that is not substantial—or is not matter—besides being unphilosophical as it makes the effect greater than the cause.

Neither can we consistently accept the more popular theory; or that which supposes the mind to be an immortal entity, this having the same objection as the former theory, being as we have before remarked, virtually the same; it is in fact more objectionable than the materialists' theory; because it supposes an entity without its possessing any of the properties that our reason informs us belong to entities.

But it is not our present purpose to discuss the merits or demerits of these theories; but to present what we conceive to be the truthful view of this subject.

Reason and philosophy both fail to solve this question. The appliances of reason become foolishness, and philosophy vanity! yet we need not grope in darkness, for as an apostle hath declared, "we have a more sure word whereunto we do well to take heed;" even the word of God. With confidence then we come to this fountain of truth.

The simple and truthful account of man's creation is given in the sure word, as follows: "The LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground." It will be perceived that thus far the creature brought to view was incapable of manifesting that which we designate *mind*. If the materialists' theory be true it were not altogether impossible that this organism, (perfect as it was) might be capable of producing mind; for the matter was all here perfectly arranged. And why not have mind? Simply because the materialists' theory is untrue. What then is needed to produce mind, if properly arranged organism is not sufficient? Listen to the remainder of the plain statement of this "sure word." "And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," or person. How simple this statement, and yet how comprehensive; for while it developes the truth, that organized matter is insufficient of itself to develop mind, it also assures us that this organism, endowed by the power of a Creator possessed the ability *through* that endowment to develop mind. This we find by the simple statement of the word. It is not organism that can produce mind, neither can mind exist independent of organism; or matter. But its manifestation depends upon the *endowment*, that a properly arranged organism receives. This being true, mind is not a substance, or matter, or a thing as some term it; *but a function*.

With this simple view, mind as an effect is not greater than its cause! its cause being the *power* that endowed the organism and not the matter itself.

If then there be a dissolution of that organism, through which this function is made apparent, mind ceases to be. P. B. S.

—

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—We do not know who the writer of the foregoing article is; but as it was sent us in a friendly manner we give it place. The class of *Materialists* the writer refers to, we have no faith in. We believe there is no such "*function*" as mind, in any *created* thing, without matter organized and made *alive*: or, in other words, mind is a result of a *living* organization. If there are Materialists who are so stupid as to maintain that the mere organism of matter produces mind, we think *their* organism is imperfect; but with such Materialists we never had any personal acquaintance, and we doubt if there are any. When a Materialist propounds the question—"Can mind exist independent of matter?" he does so, not because *he* admits mind to be an *entity*, but because his *opposers* maintain it is.—The materialism to which we assent does not "assume that matter and mind are identical"; nor admit such an idea *at all*. Simple matter has no mind; but matter organized, in a certain form, and made *alive* by the CREATOR developes mind. What more than this has our friend said? When our freind says, the reason why the perfect organism of man did not produce mind before the Creator breathed into it the breath of life, is "Simply because, the Materialist's theory is untrue," we confess, we think he has somehow misrepresented Materialism, or else he has a class specially in view who are *atheists*. We are not ashamed to avow *our materialism*; and our friend's appeal to Scripture shows he too is a materialist, if he believes the Mosaic account of creation, to which he appeals. He says, the mind is "*a function*." A function is an *office* or *employ-*

ment. We speak of "t
and nerves, of the heart
cles," etc. The mind *is*
organism of matter; a
upon the perfection of t
fection with which the
organism are performed.

From P. A. Smit

As I am around the
some, I find the preache
about George Storrs and
he is slandered very mu
one that shares the same
1st Methodist Church
review your *Six Sermo*
quite a setting out; a
Morris, in his preachin
with a Professor that I
in one of the large citi
act the *Jesuit*. So you
very much alarmed abo
mention your name, but
sion so plain I saw at o
Out near East Shelb
am holding meetings t
Infidels who have been
are taking quite a stand
ing. Yours, in hope

REMARKS BY THE E
Br. SMITH is instrume
dels" to the way of lif
him in the good work.

As to "Professors,"
and misrepresent us, w
master; and God will ju
We shall sleep just as
as confidingly as if no "
business is to please
should we cease to be a
professors of religion m
Jesuit is "one noted fo
very "cunning" to assu
den. See Math. 23: 5

From B. S. Batch

Bro. Storrs:—By al
as yet, to prove that t
raised, I am not convi
will be reserved unto t
punished. Yet the ma
gation has been conduc
see an exhibition of Ch
the discussion of religi
vilege.

I am not of the opini
tion of the resurrection
ought not be discussed,

ment. We speak of "the *functions* of the brain and nerves, of the heart of the liver, of the muscles," etc. The mind *is* the function of a *living* organism of matter; and its perfection depends upon the perfection of the organism, and the perfection with which the various functions of that organism are performed.

From P. A. Smith, Rochester, N. Y.

As I am around the country in these parts some, I find the preachers are very much troubled about George Storrs and his doctrines; and I find he is slandered very much. He is not the only one that shares the same fate. Mr. Watts of the 1st Methodist Church of this city undertook to review your *Six Sermons*. I heard he gave you quite a setting out; and I heard one Professor Morris, in his preaching refer to a conversation with a Professor that held a discussion with you, in one of the large cities about how you would act the *Jesuit*. So you see these Professors are very much alarmed about the truth. He did not mention your name, but he referred to the *discussion* so plain I saw at once who he meant.

Out near East Shelby, in Orleans Co., where I am holding meetings there is quite a number of Infidels who have been convinced of the truth, and are taking quite a stand; and the truth is spreading. Yours, in hope.

—

Remarks by the Editor.—We rejoice that Br. Smith is instrumental of turning some "infidels" to the way of life. May the Lord prosper him in the good work.

As to "Professors," and others, who slander and misrepresent us, we leave them to their own master; and God will judge who the "*Jesuits*" are. We shall sleep just as easy, and rest in God just as confidingly as if no "Professors" lived; for our business is to please God, not men; for then should we cease to be a servant of Christ. *Titled* professors of religion may not be "Jesuits," for a Jesuit is "one noted for cunning"; and it is not very "cunning" to assume titles Christ has forbidden. See Math. 23: 5–10.

From B. S. Batchelor, New Bedford.

Bro. Storrs:—By all the arguments put forth, as yet, to prove that the righteous only will be raised, I am not convinced but that the wicked will be reserved unto the day of *judgment* to be punished. Yet the manner in which the investigation has been conducted is truly gratifying. To see an exhibition of Christian love and candor, in the discussion of religious questions is a rare privilege.

I am not of the opinion of some, that the question of the resurrection of the wicked is one which ought not be discussed, but am sure that here, as in every other part of the Christian system, discussion will

"Break the learned scum,
And defecate the student's standing pool."

The great point, after all, I apprehend, is this: that "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." The righteous will live forever; the wicked will not: and the wicked, if raised at all, come forth as culprits, already condemned to receive, before the universe, the due reward of their deeds.

Now to me, there appears a moral necessity for this public manifestation of the righteous judgment of God: and that the wicked will die a second death seems too plainly revealed to be lightly set aside.

Hoping that the blessed gospel of Life eternal through Jesus Christ alone, may not be hindered I remain yours in Hope.

"From MacKnight Jr."

It seems to me that the notion that the wicked are to have even a *temporary life* after death is confronted in very explicit terms in 2 Tim. 1: 10. "Hath abolished death," Macknight renders "hath indeed made death *ineffectual*;" Dr. Clarke says, "*Counterworked.*" Now, as I understand the text, "death" is "*Counterworked*," or "made *ineffectual*," in the case of those *only* who are to receive the "life and immortality" (*Gr., incorruption*) "brought to light through the Gospel." If this be so, and the wicked are not to be immortal, it follows that death will hold in its grasp all who are not "asleep in Christ." For, admit that the wicked dead will *live* again, and you must admit that the "death" mentioned in the text is just as really "made ineffectual" in their case as in respect to the saints. And if that be a *fact*, I am at a loss to see any sense in the Apostle's language unless I admit the unscriptural explanation which Universalism offers. Of what importance do you regard the text? I have not seen you urge it in any of your replies to Bro. Grew. Do I misapprehend its import?

The Office of the Bible Examiner is at our *Residence*, 62 *Hicks Street*, Brooklyn; a short distance from *Fulton Ferry:* but in all cases *address* us as follows:

Geo. Storrs,
Box **4658**,
New York.

Usually we can be found at home at all hours except between 9 and 11 o'clock in the morning. We have *an Agency* at 109 *Nassau Street, New York*, in the Book Store of *Fairchild & Co.*, where our works can be had *at retail*, and where orders may be left for us, as we shall call there daily between the hours indicated above. City subscribers who call for their papers will find them there hereafter.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, May 15, 1856.

THE RESURRECTION.

1 Corinthians 15th Considered.

We shall endeavor to arrive at the true sense of the apostle in this chapter touching the resurrection.

At the opening of his remarks he says, "Moreover, *brethren*"—this shows who were the persons *addressed:* persons *in Christ*—"I declare unto *you* the gospel"—*the good news*, or *glad tidings*—"which I *preached* unto you,"—he speaks in the epistle of things he had previously proclaimed among them, personally—"which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved"—ye "*have life*," Syriac—"if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain."

Thus, at the opening of the chapter, it is seen that the gospel is *glad tidings of* LIFE *to them that* BELIEVE.

The apostle proceeds to show *how* this life was opened up to our view, and he states that "Christ *died* for our sins"—"was *buried*"—"and *rose again*." Our sins unpardoned must hold us in death, or under its dominion. Christ found us sinking under death's dominion, and to reach our state went down under death, though he "knew no sin"—it was for *our sins* he went there, that he might fully take hold of our nature, and by rising from the dead become THE HEAD *of a new creation* from the dead; or obtain the right to *re-create* those who should believe in him. But unless their sins were *remitted* they could not be embraced in *that right*, "for the law of sin and death" held them and they cannot be *redeemed*—or liberated—from its *curse;* but Christ became "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that *believeth*." Hence Christ has obtained the right to *re-create* all such, by restoring them to life from the dead.

Paul goes on to demonstrate, by *witnesses*, that Christ did rise from the dead; and this testimony is of such a nature as to admit of no other construction than that of a *literal reviving* into life of the same identical Christ who died. The apostle speaks of those who *saw* him at different times after he arose, and says, "he was seen of above five hundred *brethren* at once; of whom the greater part" were alive when he wrote his epistle, "but some are *fallen asleep*"; *i. e.*, are *dead*.—Paul adds—"Last of all he was *seen* of me also." This fact he re-affirms elsewhere. The *actual revival* into *life* of Christ is the important fact the apostle thus establishes, and he regards it as a pledge or assurance of the *revival* of all those who have not "believed in vain," *i. e.*, who do not "draw back" from the faith thus set forth in the *glad tidings*.

The apostle continues—"Now if Christ be preached that *he rose from the dead*, how say some among you that there is *no* resurrection of the of the dead?" That is—Have we not proclaimed to you, and demonstrated by unimpeachable witnesses, that Christ did rise from the dead? how is it then that any among you should deny the living again from the dead? "But if there be *no* resurrection of the dead"—no such thing as living again from the dead—"then is Christ not risen": and what is the consequence of this denial of any revival from the dead? "If Christ be not risen"—as their denial of *any* resurrection clearly implied—"then is our preaching vain"; our proclamation, or the glad tidings that Christ would *re-create* those who have not "believed in vain"; nor is that all—"your faith is also vain"; your faith of *life* from the dead, through Christ, is ineffectual—it will never be realized. But this denial of the revival into life from the dead, charges us, saith the apostle, with a great sin:—"Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be the dead rise not; for if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised."

We pause at this point to settle an item which it is important to understand before we go further.

Was there to be a revival into life of the dead if Christ had never "died and rose again?" Very few, if any, will take the affirmative of this question.—Then it follows, inevitably, that the apostle was not arguing the revival of Christ into life on the ground that *all* the dead were to be revived; or on the ground of a "general resurrection," as some speak; for, that would make this "general resurrection" the *cause*, and the revival of Christ the *effect* of that cause, which is, in fact, to deny Christ as "*the resurrection, and the life*." Hence to our mind, it is clear that the apostle's argument is this:—To deny the *possibility* of a revival from the dead is to deny the resurrection of Christ; for if the dead *cannot* be raised—as some among you say—then it follows, Christ is not risen; and if he be not risen no others will rise; and your belief that you shall have *life* through him is vain.

The apostle's preaching had for its solar point

the resurrection of Christ; and that revival into life as the foundation of all hope of a future life at all; and in preaching that *hope* he shows that it was a hope founded on *promise*, and he never speaks of it otherwise; or he never represents it as *a curse*. Let us look at him when he stands before Agrippa, Acts 26th. "I stand and am judged *for the hope of* THE PROMISE"—not, the *threat*—"made of God unto the fathers" * * * "for which *hope's sake*, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews." He adds—"Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should *raise the dead?*" Some, even then, occupied the ground that the revival of the dead to life was "incredible"—impossible; just as some of the Corinthians did. But we see from this quotation from Paul's discourse, before Agrippi, that his preaching had been the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and through that the *promise* of God to the fathers was to be fulfilled by their resurrection; which revival into life was a matter of *hope* based on the promise. As a matter of hope, based on promise, it could embrace *none* but such as were "persuaded of, and embraced" *the promise*. Hence none of the rejectors of it could be of the number to be revived into life. Thus far the discourse relates specially to the Jews and their ancestors, but the apostle goes on to speak of his conversion, and what commission he received of the Lord Jesus when he appeared unto him, or when he saw him: "I am Jesus" * * * "I send thee to the *Gentiles*, to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that *they may receive* REMISSION OF SINS, and *inheritance* among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."

Here it is distinctly brought out that the *believing* Gentiles are to be *partakers* of the "*promise* made of God unto the fathers." In order to be such, they must "receive forgiveness of sins," else the curse of *death* must abide on them; but by the proclamation of the glad tidings of life from the dead—through Christ's death and revival into life—they are assured if they turn from Satan—or the works they practiced in their darkness—to God, they should receive forgiveness, and this should be followed by sanctification and a part in the inheritance promised to the fathers.

That inheritance being matter of promise, was not so clearly expressed unto the fathers as it is now revealed by the gospel of Jesus Christ. The fathers embraced the promise of God, though they found themselves dying without having received the fulfillment; hence their faith counted that God was able to raise them up from the dead, and that He would do it, that His promise should not fail. See Heb. eleventh chap. throughout.

Paul goes on thus before Agrippa—"Having obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing to both small and great, saying *none other things* than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should *rise* from the dead, and should show *light* unto the people"—the Jews—"and to the Gentiles."

Two things are specially observable here.—*First*: Paul preached nothing different or contrary to what Moses and the prophets taught. They did teach of Christ, and of life through his resurrection from the dead to those who *believed* God, and governed themselves by His known requirements. But they did *not* teach a *future life* to the wicked and rebellious, at all: hence Paul did not. *Second:* through the death and revival to life of Christ, *light* was to be shown to the Jews, or people, and to the Gentiles: that is, a light such as neither had ever possessed before. Though Moses and the prophets had rays of light on the future life, drawn from the promises of God of blessings which were not enjoyed in this, yet theirs was but a twilight; it remained for the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus to bring "life and immortality to light" in an unmistakable manner, so as to clear all doubt about it. The gospel—the *glad tidings*—which Paul was commissioned to proclaim to Jews and Gentiles, announced the truth, *clearly*, that Jesus Christ—to all that believe on his name, and receive forgiveness of sins—has "abolished"—*abrogated, annulled*—"death, and hath brought life and immortality to light." Such is the glorious light brought to view by the teaching, sufferings, death, and revival of Christ. "He was delivered"—unto death—"for our offences, and was raised again for our justification," or *acquittal* from death.

We now proceed with our remarks direct on 1 Corth. 15, having shown what Paul *did* preach and what he did *not* preach. He *did* preach life from the dead only through Jesus, and that as a matter of *promise*, and not of *threat;* hence it was to the *believers* in the promise, and to no other; he leaves all others where the curse of the law of the dispensation they were under left them, *viz:* in *death.*—But a resurrection can be had by *promise;* therefore a revival into life is possible: to deny this is to say there is "*no* resurrection" none of the dead will rise. Well, saith the apostle "If the dead will not rise"—if a resurrection from the dead is

"incredible" and impossible, as some say—"then is not Christ raised"; for Christ *was dead:* "and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain"—all your confidence in a future life unavailing, for—"ye are yet in your sins";—there has been no remission of them, and the penalty takes its course, and you sink in an unbroken death, which is the penal result of sins untaken away—*i. e.* you die without hope of revival into life. "Then they too which are fallen asleep in Christ *are perished.*"

Here the apostle speaks as if it was a matter of course—understood by all believers—that all who had died in their sins were perished, and would have no revival from death; but if there is *no* resurrection of any one, then those who have fallen asleep in Christ—and hence in hope of a revival into life—are dead without revival, or are perished, like other men who have no faith in Christ; hence he adds—"If in this life only we have *hope* in Christ *we* are *of all men* most miserable." Other men gratify every appetite unrestrained, eating, drinking, and pursuing the pleasures of this life as best they may; but we, believers, deny self, endure trials, deprivations, persecutions, and sometimes submit to death itself, in hope of another life by a resurrection. Better, then, if there is no resurrection to *hope* for, to do as the worldlings do, and make the best of *this life.*

Such seems to be the apostle's reasoning. He appears to treat it as a settled truth, that need not to be insisted on, because not doubted by the believers in Christ, that those who did not come to Christ for *life*—or the remission of their sins—would never see life, or be revived from the dead; and that but for Christ "*we*"—*believers*—would be in the same condemnation not to see life.

After taking this hopeless view of our condition, on the supposition that there is *no* resurrection for any one, he revives and exclaims—"But now is *Christ risen* from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." Here we see, distinctly, what the apostle makes the pledge of a revival from the dead; and it is not the idea that there is to be a general, or universal revival of the dead: but the fact that Christ has been raised is the pledge that those who have received the "forgiveness of sins"—so as not to be *in their sins*—should share in his revival; he is the first fruits—or the *pledge*—not of the *harvest* of those *unlike* him—as all in their sins are, but—"of them that *slept*" *in* him; who have their sins taken away. Corresponding with this idea is the apostle's language 1 Thes. 4: 14, "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." It is them—and they only—that Jesus became the first fruits of, by his revival into life from the dead. To such only is there a promise of *life* from the dead either in Moses' or the prophets' writings, and Paul taught "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come"; and they never said the wicked dead should live again, either by promise or threatening. Hence in all the apostle saith on the subject of revival from the dead, in this chapter, we see no reason for assuming that he included, at all, any but those whose sins were forgiven: of their revival Christ was the pledge and the first fruits. These are "*the dead*" of whom he speaks; and in our judgment he speaks of no other dead; and though it is *a* truth that *all men* die by a connection with the first Adam, yet that is not *the* truth the apostle now proceeds to state: he is speaking, we think, of the dead in Christ, or those who fall asleep *in him.* "For since by man came death"—to those who fall asleep in Jesus—"by man came also the resurrection of the dead"—of which Christ in the *first fruits.* "For as in Adam all die"—who fall asleep in Jesus—"even so *in* Christ shall all be made alive," who sleep in him.

The objectors to a revival of any of the dead, might be supposed to allege, that if God designed to confer a life beyond this, on believers, He would not suffer them to die, but *translate* them, as He did Enoch and Elijah; and that He did not so translate them was evidence to their minds that there would be *no* resurrection of them from death: and they might further urge, that if a future life was intended for them the "forgiveness of sins" should be a pledge of exemption from dying; but as it was not, the presumption was against any resurrection, and all the good of the remission of sins was the benefit derived from it in *this life.*

That such was the argument of these deniers of the resurrection seems quite likely, if not certain, from the apostle's reply. He shows, in the first place, that their objection would exclude the idea that Christ's death was a *reality;* or if it was real, he had never been raised from the dead; but Paul insists on these two points as that which "first of all" he "received" and taught; and hence expresses his wonder that some professed believers, "among" the Corinthians, should maintain there is "no resurrection" of the dead ones. He argues that upon their hypothesis Christ himself had not been raised, and all hope of a future life was vain, and the apostles were "false witnesses." He states that such "*hope* in Christ"—pertaining

only to "*this life*"—as these persons spoke of, made believers more miserable than any other men—"*of all men* most miserable"—and that so far from any advantage, in this life, being derived to believers, they were still in their sins, on the hypothesis of these deniers of the resurrection, and those who had "fallen asleep in Christ," in hope of a revival, "are perished." Such were the consequences and results of this false doctrine of "*no* resurrection."

But, "why do believers die, if the forgiveness of sins insures a future life?" these persons might ask. Paul answers—Death came by *man*—Adam the first: and *life* must come by another man, if it comes at all: it is by connection with Adam, as descendants from him, that death came to those whose personal sins are forgiven; but by another man, who died and rose again, their resurrection is secured: "for as in Adam"—they, *believers*—"all die, even so in Christ shall"—they, *believers*—"all be made alive."

Such appears to us to be the bearings of the question which is in dispute between Paul and his opponents: and such seems to be the true interpretation of the first part of this chapter. Nor does the following verse militate against this view; for the "every man" is only every one of whom the apostle had spoken, and which he now states to be *the man* Christ Jesus, who was the "first fruits," and "afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." This is the "order" of the resurrection, or *series* by which the dead are raised; and it answers an objection which his opponents might have raised, that if the dead believers were to have another life, all who had died before Christ's revival should have been raised when he was, and all who had believed since should not have died at all; but Paul teaches that "every man" is to be revived "in his own order": Christ was to be *first;* afterward, at his return from heaven, *all* that are his. The remaining part of the chapter goes to confirm this view, as we shall see before we have done. When the believers in Jesus are raised from death to life, "*then*"—not a thousand years afterward—"cometh the end"—not then cometh *another resurrection.* Whatever "the end" is, here spoken of, we do not doubt it is the end of something which takes place *immediately* at the resurrection of them "that are Christ's." If any wish to know what our view of "the end" is, we refer them to our article on the "*Two Thrones,*" published in the EXAMINER in 1850, which view we have seen no occasion materially to alter.

P. S. Since the foregoing was prepared for the EXAMINER we have received Br. H. H. HALL'S *third* rejoinder—or a reply to our response of April 15th. Br. GREW and MACKNIGHT JR. being in advance of Br. Hall, in their communications, we have given them the precedence in this number. And we may as well say here, that *Macknight Jr.* is one who has seldom written anything for the EXAMINER, but is most deeply studious in scripture.

Books Received.

"THE ROMAN EXILE, *by Dr. Guglielmo Gajani, Prof. of Civil and Canon Law, and Representative of the People in the Roman Constituent Assembly in the year* 1849." *Price* $1.

This work, so far as we have examined it, is one of deep interest, and shows the abominable workings of Papacy, and the sufferings of a liberty loving people.

"MEMOIR OF REGINALD HEBER, D. D., *Bishop of Calcutta: By his Widow. Abridged by a clergyman.*" *Price* $1.

Though we have not had time critically to examine this work, we cannot doubt it is both a useful and interesting volume. The man who composed the hymn, "From Greenland's icy mountains," &c., or the "*Missionary Hymn*"; also, "*Star of the East,*" commencing, "Brightest and best of the sons of the morning," must have something in his composition attractive to the lovers of good men.

PETER GOTT, *a Cape Ann Fisherman, by J. Reynolds, M. D.*" An interesting story no doubt, though we have not found time to examine it much.

"THE FLOWER GARDEN; *or, Breck's Book of Flowers;* in which are described the various hardy herbaceous perennials, anuals, shrubby plants, and evergreen trees, desirable for ornamental purposes, with directions for their cultivation. By JOSEPH BRECK, seedsman and Florist, former Editor of the New England Farmer and the Horticultural Register." A very useful work for those who are interested in the topic of which it treats.

These works are Published by JOHN P. JEWETT & Co., *Boston,* and for sale by SHELDON, BLAKEMAN & Co., of this city.

"THE GOSPEL HOPE, *By Geo. Storrs.*"—This is a discourse published some years since in the EXAMINER, and afterwards issued in a tract 18mo. It is now issued in a 12mo. tract of 12 pages in larger type and on better paper, by S. M. LOCKE and others of Lewiston, Me. That is, those friends have furnished the entire funds for its re-issue. It can be had of Br. LOCKE, as above, or of us in any quantity. Price $1.25 per 100, or $10 per thousand.

This tract exposes the unscriptural idea of "going to heaven at death," and shows that the *resurrection* is the true "*Gospel Hope.*"

Reply to "Macknight Jr."

BY HENRY GREW.

Not doubting the sincerity of my friend's declaration that he "wants the *truth* and that alone," I cheerfully comply with his request, and humbly attempt to "show wherein (I) believe (him) wrong," praying that we may yet be united in the truth of "the second death" which divine justice reserves for the wicked. Rev. 2 : 11 ; 20 : 14.

I must object to the paraphrase on our Lord's words, Luke 20 : 37, 38, because the words employed there express an idea which our Lord's words do not express or warrant.

"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living ; for all live unto him." Now, I ask, what is there here to warrant the idea that Christ and the Sadducees were agreed in the belief that "the deceased wicked—are never to be made alive" as the paraphrase represents? Our Lord's plain teaching is, that the words of Moses, prove the resurrection of the dead, i. e. the dead *in general*. This was the subject of consideration between the Lord and the Sadducees. "Now that the dead are raised," verse 37. Our blessed Master does not say, "Now that the (*righteous*) dead are raised."

Let us however admit, for the present, that our Saviour *in this passage* simply declares that the righteous dead will be raised : this will not sustain the paraphrase. The declaration that one class of men, *viz* : the righteous, shall be raised, is perfectly consistent with his declaration in another passage, John 5 : 28, 29, that both classes shall be raised. "ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life (i. e. eternal life) and they that have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation." In the name of truth, I ask, how can the declaration, in one passage, that there shall be a resurrection of the just, invalidate the declaration in another "that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust?" Acts 24 : 15.

It will be admitted I presume, by my friend, Macknight Jr., that our Lord's words, "all live unto him," Luke 20 : 38 are founded on the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. I submit now, whether or not our Lord's plain declaration John 5 : 28, 29 that there shall be a resurrection of both classes, is not an implied declaration (contrary to the paraphrase) that both classes shall be made alive. As the reason our Lord assigns why the dead righteous live unto God, is their resurrection ; it follows that the dead wicked, whose resurrection he as plainly and positively declares John 5 : 28, 29, do also live unto him ; which certainly they may do, though not eternally. The idea of *dead corpses* rising to stand at the judgment seat, to "*give account*" Math. 12 : 36, be judged, and condemned ; is too absurd to be admitted.

It may be said, that our Lord in John 5 : 28, 29, speaks of the righteous only as having a "resurrection of *life*." This however presents no difficulty, when we consider that he often used the simple word "life." to denote *eternal* life.—Thus he told the Jews 6 : 53. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you ;" although they possessed natural life. "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world, i. e. eternal life. 51 verse "He that eateth me, even he shall live by me." 57 verse. (i. e. eternally.) "The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world." i. e. eternal life. 23d verse. "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life : "i. e. eternal life. John 5 : 40. "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." John 6 : 68. i. e. eternal life, "Because I live ye shall live also :" i. e. eternally. "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life," John 3 : 36 : i. e. eternal life.

In reference to the words, "I am the God of Abrahanr," &c., our brother remarks, "the relation here brought to view, is no where in the Pentateuch said to exist, and hence it does not exist, between God and the *eternally* non-existent, (i. e., the wicked,) and it is thus seen to be peculiar to the righteous." How so? May there not be a *common* relationship of the Creator to all men, and yet a *peculiar* relationship to his redeemed children? This common relationship is taught by Moses himself; Numbers 16 : 22. and also 27 : 16, declaring Jehovah to be "the God of the spirits of all flesh," although many of them then were, and many others yet are, *morally*, the children of the wicked one. All men "are his offspring." Acts 17 : 28. That the righteous dead, by the riches of divine favor in Jesus Christ will be entitled to glorious "privileges," is true, but how this can impart the shadow of proof, that the wicked dead are not reserved to a "resurrection of condemnation" to suffer "the second death," (Rev. 20) I cannot perceive. Surely it is no "*privilege*" to be raised, to be "cast into the lake of fire," to be "hurt of the second death," which the inspired apostle most clearly teaches, will be the fearful doom of those whose names are "not found written in the book of life." Rev. 20 : 11–15. The phrases that God is the God of Abraham, &c., and "the God of the spirits of all flesh," are *abstractly* considered, equally significant, although other passages plainly teach that he is the God of the former, in an important sense, in which he is not the God of the latter.

The supposition that by the dead (verse 38) "Christ designated the *deceased wicked*" only, is inadmissible, because his simple argument is, that if there is no resurrection, he would be the God of the dead, by being "the God of Abraham," &c. Our brother indeed is "aware that to admit (his) view on this point, is to yield the notion of the living again of the wicked dead." This, in my opinion, would be to yield the plain testimony of the word of the Lord, as I humbly conceive I have proved in the Examiner.

As I consider the moral consequences of rejecting this doctrine, and of teaching that the impenitent have nothing to fear after the first death, are

of very serious and lamentable character, I respectfully submit to the candid review of my friend "Macknight Jr." and the reader the following passages as establishing the doctrine:—John 5: 28, 29. Luke 2: 4, 5. Acts 24: 15; 17: 31. Heb. 9: 27. Matt. 7: 21, 22; comp. Luke 13: 24–28. 73 Ps. 2 Cor. 5: 10, 11. Luke 12: 43–48; 11: 31, 32. 1 John 2: 28. Rev. 20: 11–15. Romans, 2d chapter, noticing the connection of the 6th and 16th verses, comparing the latter with Acts 17: 31. Job. 14: 12. Dan. 12: 2. Rev. 11: 18. Jude 14, 15. 1 Peter 4: 5. Rev. 1: 7; 2: 23–25; 22: 12. Matt. 12: 36. Ingenuity may perhaps present some plausible objections to the obvious import of these testimonies. I ask our brother Macknight Jr., my beloved brother Storrs, and the readers in general of the Examiner, to review these, passages and consider, in the exercise of their good common sense, their manifest import. May the Spirit of Truth unite us in the faith of the true doctrine of the Lord. "Grace be with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

HENRY GREW.

Response to Henry Grew's Reply.

BY MACKNIGHT JR.

The Editor's courtesy in granting me the use of Bro. GREW's manuscript, and thereby enabling me to accompany its publication with an answer in the same number of the EXAMINER, is gratefully appreciated, as is also the spirit of brotherly kindness which pervades the "Reply."

Bro. Grew having introduced the particular matter upon which he takes issue with me by a reference to the death which, according to his view, "divine justice reserves for the wicked," I may be allowed to call attention to one or two declarations of Holy Writ having a bearing upon this question of "*justice*," even though I refuse to be drawn into the general discussion in which he and "Respondent" have been engaged. The solicitude with which Bro. Grew would discountenance any theory of punishment that fails to recognize, in their full extent, the claims of "divine justice," was unquestionably felt by the inspired PSALMIST; and a somewhat attentive examination of all *his* utterances relative to the final condition of the impenitent, has strongly inclined me to the belief that the doctrine of the re-living of the wicked dead cannot be harmonized with his teaching. Let us listen to his prayer in the twenty-eighth Psalm: "Draw me not away with the wicked, and with the workers of iniquity, which speak peace to their neighbors, but mischief *is* in their hearts.—Give them according to their deeds, and according to the wickedness of their endeavors: give them after the works of their hands; render to them their DESERT. Because they regard not the works of the LORD, nor the operation of his hands, he shall DESTROY them, and not build them up."—No comment is needed to show that the fullest measure of "divine justice" to certain ungodly characters is what DAVID here invoked, and yet we see that *destruction* was the greatest evil which an answer to his petition involved. The ready reply to this will be, I presume, that the penalty denounced is that which is to follow the torment consequent upon the re-living of the ungodly. But does not the PSALMIST elsewhere confront such a view in the most unequivocal terms? We will turn to the thirty-fifth Psalm, and see whether the imprecations found there do not justify an affirmative answer to this inquiry. I quote from verse fourth and onward: "Let them be confounded and put to shame that seek after my soul: let them be turned back and brought to confusion that devise my hurt. Let them be as the chaff before the wind: and let the angel of the LORD chase *them*. Let their way be dark and slippery: and let the angel of the Lord persecute them. For without cause they have hid for me their net *in* a pit, *which* without cause they have digged for my soul. Let DESTRUCTION come upon him at UNAWARES; and let HIS NET which he hath hid CATCH HIMSELF: into THAT VERY DESTRUCTION let HIM fall." I would ask my dear brother Grew, in all sincerity whether the real and scriptural significance of the testimony here cited "presents no difficulty" to *his* view of "the second death." The words I have emphasized in verse eighth convey a sense to my own mind which no other theory of "divine justice" than the one he opposes with so much zeal will permit them to bear. The phrase "'THAT VERY DESTRUCTION" can not, it appears to me, be made to tally with his conceptions of truth without an unwarrantable disregard of the most obvious import of the immediate context. If Bro. Grew will not everlook this paragraph in any reply with which he may favor me, I may wish to suggest for his consideration other portions of the book of Psalms which, if I do not misunderstand them, make the infliction of such a DEATH as will admit of not even a temporary resurrection *life* to be *the* punishment of sin demanded by "divine justice;" and he may yet come to see that "the moral consequences of rejecting" his present "doctrine" are in the highest degree beneficial to perishing men and honorable to the GOD of LOVE.—But I must not now dwell upon this point.

I have very carefully pondered Bro. Grew's reasons for rejecting my paraphrase of Luke 20: 37, 38; the result is a more perfect conviction that the paraphrase is, in all its parts, exactly correct.—The reader will please turn to the EXAMINER of March 15th and re-peruse the paraphrase in connection with the "Reply" and Response in the present number. Before proceeding to notice Bro. Grew's objections, I will say that I was surprized beyond measure by the position he has taken, in his "Reply," relative to our Lord's discourse with the Sadducees. I had supposed that every intelligent advocate of the unconsciousness of the dead held (as do not a few "Orthodox" expositors) that the Saviour's argument proved only the resurrection of the righteous. That my respondent should, at this late day, insist so confidently upon a different view of the matter, will, I am persuaded, astonish the large majority of his readers, however warmly they may sympathize with him in the belief that those who wander "out of the way of understanding shall" *not* "remain in the congregation of the dead." And well it may; look at it. In the EXAMINER for 1852, Bro.

Grew, writing over the signature of "*Veritas*," contended strenuously for the doctrine of the re-living of the wicked dead, in reply to articles from the pen of our esteemed brother JACOB GRIM, but nowhere did he intimate a conviction that his øwn side of the question was supported by Luke 20: 37, 38. My *opinion* is, (I trust I am not uncharitable,) that *all that time he did not think so.* How has it been more recently? Some eight months since the EDITOR of the EXAMINER announced the following question as one which he would like to have discussed:—"Is there positive testimony that the wicked dead will be made *alive?*" Bro. Grew promptly opened the investigation on the affirmative, and was answered by his Respondent. Now the presumption is certainly a fair one that if Bro. Grew did not in any of his numerous articles (which, by the way, have the appearance of *exhausting* the question to the extent of the author's ability) bring forward Luke 20: 37, 38, as "positive testimony," nor as "testimony" of any kind, his doing so *now* is an *after thought* forced upon him *by the pressure of a new argument.* The fact upon this point is, he has not once cited this scripture against his "Respondent," though the latter has, on the fifty-eighth page of the current volume of the EXAMINER, urged it as having exclusive reference to the righteous, and as one which might "'be fairly held to exclude others,' *viz:* all the wicked, from 'future existence,' or *life.*" "In the name of truth, I ask," how *could* Bro. Grew, in his commendable anxiety to "unite us in the faith of the true doctrine of the Lord," allow his opponent the *unmolested* use of texts in defence of the negative, if he himself regarded them as "positive testimony" (the very thing called for) on the affirmative side? Were his proofs so ample, and so unmistakable in their character, that he could dispense with what *he* will doubtless say is the *only direct argument* in the Bible which embraces in its logic the fact that *all* the dead, regardless of moral character, will "be made *alive?*" Will it be convenient for our brother to meet these queries without admitting that, until *very recently*, he has been accustomed to regard this admirable discourse of the Saviour as proving only the future life of that blood—washed throng which he hopes soon to meet in the everlasting kingdom "of our Lord, and of his Christ?"

As, however, the change of opinion which the "Reply" seems to disclose is not, of itself, evidence that Bro. Grew has exchanged truth for error, I should carefully attend to the considerations he urges against my paraphrase; in endeavoring to do which it will be my aim to "exercise" all the "good common sense" that has fallen to my lot, and to practice no "ingenuity" which the singular reasoning of my venerable and esteemed brother does not seem to demand. "The *truth* and that alone," is what I still want.

The inquiry contained in the third paragraph of the "Reply" shall be answered; but I pass it for the present, and call attention to the statements which immediately follow it. "Our Lord's plain teaching is," says Bro. Grew, "that the words of Moses prove the resurrection of the dead, i. e., the dead *in general.* This was the subject of consideration between our Lord and the Sadducees." In other words—*The resurrection of the dead* IN GENERAL, *was the* SUBJECT OF CONSIDERATION *between our Saviour and the Sadducees.* The correctness of this remarkable position I deny with emphasis, feeling well assured that it is in point blank contradiction of "plain teaching" which, under ordinary circumstances, it would be very difficult to misunderstand or misconstrue. A more unguarded statement I think cannot be found in anything Bro. Grew has written, and I must believe that he penned it without much reflection. He will be obliged, it seems to me, to recall it without qualification, unless he is willing, (as we all know he is not) to stand committed to a proposition involving down right Universalism. Let us attend to the revealed facts in the case, and learn if we can where the truth lies. The sacred narrative says—"Then came to *him* certain of the Sadducees, (which deny that there is any resurrection) and asked him," etc. *What* resurrection, let me inquire, did the Sadducees "deny?" *That which Jesus taught,* will be the ready answer of all. Did they suppose the Saviour's doctrine involved a renewal of the marriage relation in the resurrection state? Evidently they did, as clearly appears from their question, "whose wife shall she be?" If, then, the Sadducees understood our Lord to teach that a *miserable temporary future life* was in reserve for the wicked dead, *would* they have supposed that his doctrine connected *marriage* with this state of *penal torment?* Such a supposition being too absurd for serious consideration, we conclude that the cavils and the inquiry of the Sadducees had to do with the doctrine of "the resurrection" of the *righteous only.* In other words, they introduce to "our Lord" a "subject" for "consideration" which was far less "general" than my respondent's proposition supposes.—Not one hint did they give that they understood Christ's doctrine of life after death to embrace the unholy. Has not this fact (which I commend to the reader's attention) a significance which is too much ignored by the theory Bro. Grew advocates?

Our Lord's reply, to which we next come, begins thus: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." Then, after referring to the fact that "the children of this world marry and are given in marriage," he says—"they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and (*kai,* even) the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels of God in heaven, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." That the foregoing language of our Saviour has reference exclusively to a state which the *good alone* will "obtain," is put beyond question by the expressions "accounted worthy," "neither can THEY die any more," "equal unto the angels of God in heaven," and "children of God;" and the word "THAT" designates this blessed state as being *the* one to which the Sadducees referred when they demanded, "therefore in THE RESURRECTION whose wife of them is she?"

Having now, as I humbly conceive, shown con-

clusively that the resurrection of the deceased *righteous—not* that of "the dead *in general*," as Bro. Grew affirms—"was the subject of consideration between our Lord and the Sadducees," I submit the point to the reader and to my respondent, hoping the latter will give it special attention if he replies to me again. Bro. Grew *once* himself held to the view I have here given of the words of our Lord, as may be seen in his "Response" to Bro. GRIM in the EXAMINER for March, 1852. At that time he could hold it and still contend for the re-living of the wicked dead—but now it seems he cannot. Let this *fact* go for what it is worth. To *me* it has some importance.

In telling us that "our blessed Master does not say, 'now that the (*righteous*) dead are raised,'" Bro. Grew insinuates a sophism which is easily disposed of. He seems to affirm that the phrase "the dead," in verse 37, *necessarily* includes the wicked. Paul declares, 1 Cor. 15: 52, "THE DEAD shall be raised INCORRUPTIBLE." How does my brother exclude the *wicked* from *this* statement? The Apostle "does not say" "The (*righteous*) dead," etc.; but Bro. Grew *will* say that the context, and the description of the raised, restrict the phrase to "the dead in Christ." This is precisely what I would say of our Lord's declaration, "Now that the dead are raised." He had *explained* the resurrection of the righteous—it would be strange if his *proof* included *all* men. It did no such thing.

At this point I desire to notice the fact that Luke 20: 35 furnishes "*positive* testimony" that none but the "worthy" will "obtain * * the resurrection from the dead;" or, in other words, that *any life after death* is *conditional*. This position, after the best examination I have been able to make, I am satisfied is not inconsistent with any legitimate rendering of the Greek original in this place. Bro. Grew *has* sought relief from the force of the common translation here, by changing "from the dead" to "*out of*, or from among dead ones;" which latter rendering, he observes, "implies leaving some dead." (See EXAMINER for March, 1852.) If this be his present explanation of the matter, I would like to be informed upon what authority he assigns to *ek nekron* (the *Greek* of "*from the dead*") in Luke 20: 35 a sense different from what he would give it in any other place of its occurrence in the New Testament. *His theory* requires it, I know, but the *truth*, I think, *does not*. That the wicked will be *left dead* when God's "redeemed children" are brought from the dust to die no more, I believe; but I have yet to be convinced that such an idea is deducible from the words *ek nekron*.—One of the *many* passages in which this phrase is found and is translated "from the dead," is Romans 8: 11, where it occurs twice. "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus FROM THE DEAD (*ek nekron*) dwell in you, he that raised up Christ FROM THE DEAD (*ek nekron*) shall ALSO QUICKEN YOUR MORTAL BODIES by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Here we see that to be "raised FROM THE DEAD" imports neither more nor less than a *quickening into life*. Such a quickening my respondent believes the *wicked dead* must have, in order that "divine justice" may not be frustrated; but Paul makes it the result of the indwelling of God's Spirit, and by our Saviour it is "brought to light" as a blessing in reserve for the "worthy" *alone*. "Let God be true."

Proceeding now with Bro. Grew's "Reply," the point claiming attention is this—Is the "relationship" of Jehovah which is expressed in the declaration, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,"—"*common* to all men," or "*peculiar*" to Christians? My respondent assumes that it is the former; I will endeavor to *prove* that it is the latter. The unprejudiced reader will hardly fail to see which of us is right here, and I indulge the hope that Bro. Grew himself will see cause to relinquish his "*Common* relationship" ground, so far as it relates to our Lord's argument with the Sadducees. In support of the "*peculiar* relationship" contended for in my former article, I offer several considerations.

1. The "peculiar" and solemn circumstances under which the "relationship" in question was announced to him whom the Most High selected to "bring forth (his) people, the children of Israel, out of Egypt," evidently imply what I contend for. (See Exo. 3, and also Stephen's address in the seventh of Acts.) A great deliverance from earthly bondage was to be accomplished, and the great Deliverer made himself known as "THE GOD of the worthies from whom his oppressed "people" had descended. How any one can attentively read the third chapter of Exodus, and come to the conclusion that no "*peculiar* relationship" was expressed in the utterances Moses was commanded to rehearse to "the children of Israel,"—I cannot see. Had Moses said to his brethren, "The LORD GOD OF PHARAOH hath sent me unto you," they would *hardly* have deemed the announcement suggestive of the deliverance from servitude; and yet, if Bro Grew is correct, *such* a message and the one they actually received would have been ☞ "*equally significant*" ☜! Are incongruities like these found in "the true doctrine of the Lord?" Will my respondent please inform us?

2. A statement of the apostle in the 11th chapter of Hebrews clearly establishes the fact that *the* "relationship," and the *only* one, upon which our Lord, in his discourse with the Sadducees, founded the doctrine "THAT THE DEAD ARE (TO BE) RAISED," *does not exist between God and the wicked*. I quote from verse 13th to the 16th, inclusive: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.—For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that *country* from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better *country*, that is, a heavenly: WHEREFORE God is not ASHAMED to be called ☞ THEIR GOD: FOR he hath prepared for THEM a city." Here, then, we learn that the "relationship" which Bro. Grew supposes "the Creator" sustains to the wicked (that of being "THEIR God") is what the divine word,

by implication, declares "God" would be "*ashamed*" of! It will be worse than vain to admit that *the apostle* speaks of the "*peculiar* relationship," and yet contend that *our Lord* argued from that which is "*common* to all men." In the Saviour's discourse, the "relationship" signifies the revival to life eternal of all dead saints and all the glory accruing to such revival—in Heb. 11 : 16 it does precisely this and no more. It is therefore the same thing in both places.

3. The "*peculiar* relationship" in question is, I believe, asserted by our Lord in the declaration, "God is NOT a God of THE DEAD." Bro. Grew agrees with me that by "THE DEAD" here is meant *the* ETERNALLY *dead*, but he thinks the words are used *hypothetically*, while I regard them as designating *the deceased wicked*. The reasons I gave for so regarding them, in my former article, Bro. Grew wholly overlooks in his "Reply!" He says Christ's "simple argument is, that if there is no resurrection," God "would be the God of the dead, by being 'the God of Abraham,' &c." This position of Bro. Grew's was rendered unavoidable by his previous *assumption* that our Lord's argument proved the resurrection of "the dead *in general*," on which latter point I submit that I have demonstrated him to be in error. I will again call my respondent's attention to the important fact that all that was *essential* in our Lord's argument with the Sadducees must have its foundation in "the book of Moses," to which he appealed for proof. The Saviour's *ipse dixit* was not *proof* to them, (though it is to us,) nor would he have offered it as such. That the fact that if "God is not a God of the (*eternally*) dead," *is* vital to the argument, appears from the fact that if he *was* the "God of the (*eternally*) dead," his being "the God of Abraham" would afford no proof that Abraham would ever have a resurrection. Now, if Bro. Grew refuses to understand by "THE DEAD," of whom "God is not the God," (Luke 20 : 38,) *the deceased wicked*, how can he show from "the book of Moses" that "God is NOT a God of the (*eternally*) DEAD?" I would respectfully urge him to meet this inquiry. My view encounters no such difficulty. "At the bush" God declared himself to be the God of" certain *righteous* characters who had died, but nowhere in "the book of Moses" did he reveal himself as sustaining such a relationship to the *wicked* dead. *Silence* in regard to a relationship to one class of men, is proof that such relationship does *not* exist, *if* at the same time it is declared that the relationship *is* sustained to a class of the opposite character. The Sadducees, I doubt not, saw this clearly; but I do not perceive how they *could* have been silenced by an appeal to "the book of Moses," had not our Lord exhibited the righteous and the wicked *in contrast*. Besides all this, it seems to me other language would have been used by our Lord had he intended to speak of "the dead," Luke 20 : 38, *hypothetically*. I showed in my last article how he could have done so without ambiguity. Jesus said, "God is not a God of THE DEAD," and Bro. Grew should not, without the best of reasons, contend that he did not as really designate a *reality* by these words as he did by "THE DEAD" in verse 37 and by "THE LIVING" in verse 38. Such reasons he will not readily find if he concedes the point that "the dead" in v. 37 embraces only the *righteous*. *Does* he concede this?

On the phrase "THE LIVING," Luke 20 : 38, I remark (*again*) that, as it is not *qualified* in the text, I suppose it embraces *all* the dead who will ever "be made *alive*." But as it embraces none but those whose God the Lord is, and as "God is NOT a God of the" *wicked* dead, it follows that the latter class are DEAD in the Sadducean sense—hopelessly and finally so.

In the third paragraph of the "Reply" Bro. Grew says, in substance, that the re-living of the wicked dead would not be disproved by showing that "the dead" named in Luke 20 : 37 meant only the righteous. Is this consistent ground for him to occupy? Let us see. The Sadducees were completely "put to silence" by our Lord, and "after that, they durst not ask him any *question at all*." Luke 20 : 40. According to Bro. Grew's "Reply," this was done by our Lord's confronting the *entire* Sadducean *error* on the subject of the resurrection. This I grant was the case, and if I have shown that our Lord only asserted and proved the re-living of the dead saints, it follows that the *entire error* of the Sadducees on the subject of the resurrection consisted in their holding that *God's people* would never be recovered from the dominion of death.

Bro. Grew's reference to Numbers 16 : 22 and 27 : 16, (where Jehovah is declared to be "the God of the spirits of all flesh,") to prove a "*common* relationship," is legitimate and serves that purpose well; but I fail to see the resembling import which my brother supposes these passages and the one we have been considering have, "abstractly considered." Bro. MONCRIEFF explains "spirits" in those texts to mean "*lives*," and I believe him correct. He illustrates the passages by a reference to Ps. 104 : 29. For myself I am by no means sure that "all flesh" in Num. 16 : 22 and 27 : 16 does not include the *brute creation*. If it does, Bro. Grew would of course not regard the passages in question as affording proof of a resurrection. In more than a dozen places in the Bible the phrase "all flesh" *does* include animals. The statement "We are his offspring," in Acts 17 : 28, is sufficiently explained by the immediate context, which declares that "in him [God] we LIVE, and move, and have our being."

The already too great length of this article forbids my noticing the array of texts Bro. Grew has *reproduced* in his "Reply." They are foreign to the particular issue which I raised in my former article, and as his respondent has given attention to them all in his responses to Bro. Grew, I refer the reader to what he has written. Bro. Grew's reference to "dead corpses" I deem entirely gratuitous. "The idea" which he pronounces "absurd" I do not hold. Whoever does, should defend it. I think there are none such. On John 5 : 28, 29 I shall wish to say something, I think, by and by.

Respectfully submitted, in Christian love.

MACKNIGHT, JR.

May 3, 1856.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, JUNE 1, 1856. NO. 11.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive?

THIRD REJOINDER BY H. H. HALL.

Dear Bro. Storrs:—It is a point which is not very material whether Prof. Murdock was, or was not influenced in any way in his translation of 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22, by changing "*in*" to "*by*." The most important point to know is whether he translated it *correctly*, or in accordance with "*the undoubted meaning of the author.*"

In your reply to my quotation of 2 Cor. 6: 4, 5, which was in answer to my brother's argument with regard to the change of the preposition *dia* —by to *en*—in 1 Cor. 15; 21, 22—*you say*, "It is a perfect matter of indifference whether the preposition were translated *in* or *by*, in verse 6 and 7: the real sense would be the same in either case, as *in* would have expressed the idea of the apostle."

I am fully satisfied from further examination that the change from *dia*—by verse 21, to *en*—in verse 22 of 1 Cor. 15: does not alter "the real sense" of these verses or their connection, *though* if properly rendered *by* or *through*, it would entirely destroy your whole argument on this chapter. That the apostle did not intend to alter the sense by changing the preposition, is very evident from the fact that he uses *en* in the phrase "For as *in* Adam all die" in the same sense precisely that he uses *dia*—by in verse 21, for it relates to the same thing: so that if he had intended to change the *meaning* of the phrase "*in* Christ shall be made alive" from that of verse 21, by changing the preposition from *dia*—by to *en*—in, he would have changed it *only* in *one* instance as follows,—"For as *dia*—*by* Adam all die even so *en*—*in* Christ, shall all be made alive:" and this is the sense in which my brother is trying to make the apostle understood; but from the above, the reader can see it will not do. But you continue, "And so in the 8th verse (2 Cor. 6: 4–8) *dia* might have been rendered *in* though that is not its first sense." So I say of 1 Cor. 15: 22, *en* may be properly translated *by* or *through*, though this is not its first sense, for the apostle expresses, as before noticed, the same meaning by *en* in verse 22, that he does by *dia* in verse 21, as my brother will readily admit. "The reason therefore," you say, "why the apostle changes the preposition, in the 8th verse, and uses *dia*, is first, because it was a matter of perfect *indifference* which preposition was used, the sense being unchanged whichever was used." This is doubtless the reason why the apostle changed the proposition from *dia* to *en* in 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22—"*the sense being unchanged.*' "And secondly, it was perfectly natural," you say, "to change to *dia*—after having used *en* nineteen times in four verses—to avoid further repetition. These two considerations are a sufficient answer to Br. H. on that point. Neither of these considerations are applicable to 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22."

If the reader will turn to 2 Cor. 6: 4–8, he will see that after the apostle had used *en* nineteen times "it was a matter of perfect indifference" whether he used it twice more, or some other word in its place: or in other words if it was the mere *repetition* that caused him to change from *en* to *dia*, he would doubtless have done so before using *en* nineteen times in four verses, as the translators have done by rendering *en by* nine times and then *dia*—by twice, thus about equally dividing it.

The true reason then, of the change I apprehend is, that it did not make any difference which word was used, as either would convey the same meaning. Hence I think the *first* consideration of my brother *is* "applicable to 1 Cor. 15: 21, 22."

You again say, "When our translators have used the phrase "*in* Christ—which they have done near forty times in the New Testament—there is scarce an instance in which violence would not be done and confusion introduced by substituting the preposition *by* for *in*; and 1 Cor. 15: 22, is not an exception; nor can it be made one, unless *positive testimony* of the living again of the wicked dead can be found in other portions of inspiration, which as yet, has not been done to our mind."

I am glad my brother has here frankly acknowledged as he has, that the changing of *in* to *by* in verse 22, is not *critically* wrong, or that the change *would* be admissible *provided* that "*positive testimony* of the living again of the wicked dead can be found in other portions of inspiration." If I understand you then, it is wrong to render *en* by simply because you suppose the Bible does not elsewhere teach the resurrection of the wicked dead, and to so render it *here, would* be doing violence, not to the *rule* by which prepositions are translated, but to the *argument* which is relied on to *explain away* this *pointed* proof text in favor of the resurrection of the wicked, and to substantiate if possible the doctrince of their non-resurrection which my brother is so ably advocating.

Or in other words, you cannot admit the change of *in* to *by* in *this case*, because it will overthrow your whole argument on this chapter, and conse-

quently the doctrine itself. I think you are mistaken when you say, "There is scarce an instance in which violence would not be done and confusion introduced by substituting the preposition *by* for *in*." That you *are* mistaken I will now show by giving a few examples. The expressions "*en* Christ" and "*en* Christ Jesus" are found in the New Testament about fifty times. There is something peculiar about the *construction* of the phrases—in a word there are two classes of them: in about twenty-nine instances *en* has the meaning of *by* or *through*, and in only twenty-two it has the first sense of *in*.

In the following few examples (as I can give but few now) *en* has the sense of *by* or through, and is in a number of them so translated. "*En*—*through* Jesus Christ—ye are wise, *in* Christ—causeth us to triumph *in* Christ—is given you *by* Jesus Christ—seek to be justified *by* Christ—*in* his kindness toward us *en*—*through* Christ Jesus—on the Gentiles *en*—*through* Jesus Christ—we hope *in* Christ—is done away *in* Christ, and last not least—even so *in* Christ or *by* or *through* Christ shall all be made alive." Does not my brother see that in all the above passages *by* or *through* can be substituted and *not* do "*violence*" nor "*introduce* confusion?"

The other class is as follows—"them which are *in* Christ Jesus—who also were *in* Christ before me—if any man be *in* Christ—I knew a man *in* Christ—all that are *in* Christ Jesus—which are fallen asleep *in* Christ—the dead *in* Christ shall rise first." Here the reader can see at a glance that the *connection* and *construction* of these two classes of passages, *point out* the meaning of the preposition *en* to be *by* or *through* in the first class, and nothing but *in* in the second class. Hence this settles the question that *en* in 1 Cor. 15, 22, has the meaning of *by* or *through* instead of "*in* Christ" in the sense my brother understands it. If you could add a word as follows—THOSE "*in* Christ," &c. then the passage would belong to the second class enumerated; but by no possible criticism or argument can it be made to go there, as I believe, without adding to the word of God.

But you say, "As to Br. H's. remarks on the term '*even so*' we can afford to let him have the idea that it means '*so in like manner*,' and then the argument we presented before" (in regard to the *union* existing between Adam and *his* children, and between Christ and *his* children) "is untouched, till such time as *by* is established as the true sense of the apostle." I am sorry my brother did not answer my main argument on this point, instead of noticing only an incidental expression, as he has laid so much stress on the words "*even so*" in verse 22, making it the *main pivot* next to the preposition *in*. I hope therefore he will excuse me for referring to it again in order to obtain an answer to the argument if an answer he has.

I said that the "*even so*" has no reference whatever to the *union* existing between Adam and *his* children and Christ and *his* children, as my brother claims; but that it does have reference and only reference to the TRANSGRESSION of ADAM which brings *death* to *all*, and to the RESURRECTION of CHRIST which brings *life* to *all*—ETERNAL *life* to the *righteous*, but only *temporary life* to the *wicked*. Thus a *resurrection* to life *simply*, does not depend upon a *union* with Christ, but upon the RESURRECTION of Christ, for *his* resurrection and the resurrection of "*the dead*" is the great theme of the apostle in this chapter. Can my brother *afford to let* me have the above "*idea*" and then say the "argument" he presented before is "untouched?" and especially as I have established, as I think, that "*by* is the true sense of the apostle" in verse 22.

Again you say, "But now Christ is manifested to be the greatest curse of the wicked dead; or else, if he makes them *alive* from the dead, he will secure their eternal life, or at least give them another and better chance to secure it themselves than they had before. Is the greatest curse to the wicked the fact that Christ has risen from the dead: thereby securing their revival into life, to be tormented and killed again, regardless of all their anguish, horror, and despair? Is that indeed a gospel *benefit*?—If so the gospel is more terrible and horrible than the law, which when a sinner was dead let him alone to remain in eternal night, as Br. H. admitted in his previous article."

Christ was manifested to be a blessing to *all* who comply with the terms of the gospel, but not *in any sense* to those who wickedly reject his mercy and do despite to the spirit of his grace. "The greatest curse" as you call it, does not come upon the sinner in consequence of the RESURRECTION of Christ, but because of *their* REJECTION of Christ: they *might* and *ought* to have avoided the "*terrible*" punishment denounced against them in the Scriptures of truth, a punishment that can never find a fulfillment in any way short of "*the second death*," though it may be and ought to be "more terrible and horrible regardless of their anguish, horror and despair" than that under "the law," because there has been greater light and consequently greater guilt. Yes, the "gospel comes with blessings, and blessings only, to those who accept its promises and give heed to its sacred precepts—it comes with "good news of glad tidings that dying men may have life," it also comes with the tremendous declarations that if they reject these glad tidings, that they shall be *burned up* "*with* UNQUENCHABLE *fire*," that when the Son of Man shall come they shall be cast into "*a furnace of fire*" where "there shall be *wailing and gnashing of teeth*:" for all those who "bear thorns and briars are rejected" and are "nigh unto cursing whose END is to be BURNED"—not in *hades*, but in GEHENNA,—not "till some *fancy* law is satisfied," but till that law is satisfied which emanated from the High and Lofty One who inhabiteth eternity, and which was given on the tables of stone amid the lightnings and thunderings of Mount Sinai, which made Moses even to say, "I exceedingly fear and quake." The righteous and wicked go into *hades* because of ADAM'S transgression, but the wicked dead are to be raised to life to die "the second death" in *Gehenna* because of their *own* trangressions: "For since by man" [the first Adam] "came death, by man" [the second Adam] "came also the resurrection of *the* dead.

For as by Adam" [or *through* his TRANSGRESSION] "ALL die, even so by Christ [or *through* his RESURRECTION] "shall *all* be made alive." Here then is the proof that "revelation" is *not* silent in regard to your question,—"For what purpose or end" is "the sinner" to be "made alive and tormented awhile?" It is to satisfy the law of God for the *personal* transgression of *the sinner*, and *not* for ADAM'S transgression, the penalty of which I still claim it executed on the *righteous* as well as the *wicked*.

You "regret" that "I can see no difference between the case of Adam and his posterity" and ask, "Are Adam's posterity during their trial, or probation—under the *same law* that Adam was?" I do not know how my brother could have understood me as *even* intimating that the posterity of Adam is under the same law that he was. I did say and still say that the *penalty* of the Adamic law is executed on his posterity, and that without exception. Does it therefore follow that they are "under the *same* law?" Not at all. *Death* was the penalty of the law given to Adam, and would have been death without revival, but for the manifestation, death, and resurrection of Christ: this same death Adam's posterity have inherited—they are ALL *of* the dust and return to dust again. *Death* is also the penalty of the law given on the tables of stone, and in order to the execution of which, the wicked dead *must* live again, because the *execution* of death as the penalty of the law given to Moses, is altogether *different* as we have seen, and shall further see, from the *execution* of death in the penalty of the Adamic law.

Now then, if Adam's death is eternal, i. e. past being made alive again, the manifestation of Christ not affecting *him*, as my brother believes, and his posterity that reject Christ, also die in the same sense, does it not certainly follow on this hopothesis, that the *wicked* are under the same law that Adam was, and suffer precisely the same penalty and *that* not because of their *own* transgressions, but because of ADAM'S transgression? for *through his* transgression *death* came into the world! Here is something for my brother to harmonize with his view. Can he do it?—we shall see. Again you ask, "Had the *old* covenant with Adam a *promise* of life, if he committed *one* act of disobedience? Was there any hint that he might be forgiven that one act if he committed it? Was he informed that there might be *hope* in his case if he sinned? Was he told that if he sinned he had 'an *Advocate* with the Father'? Was not Adam's *one* sin to decide his fate?" Your questions will apply with equal force in reference to Abel, Seth, Enos, &c., as I know of no especial promise made directly to them that *they* should have "*an Advocate with the Father*" in case they sinned; for the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head—*they* could no more claim than Adam, as God spoke not *to man*, but directly to the *serpent*; Gen. 3 : 14, I however think this *promise* which has always been considered a "*promise*" related to the whole human family—that as *all* men had sinned and come short of the glory of God—*all* that would repent of sin and turn to God through "the seed of the woman," should have "eternal life." "For God *so* loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that WHOSOEVER" [*Adam* as well as Abel]" believeth in him should not perish but have EVERLASTING life."—Now then when Bro. S. will prove that ADAM *is* excepted in the above declaration of Christ, and that the "*whosoever*" in this and other similar passages, does not refer to *any* and *every* man however guilty he may be, and that if he *repent* and *believe*, that Christ will *not* receive and save him, I will pledge myself to prove that God has foreordained and predestinated that a certain portion of the human family *shall be* damned whether they *repent* or not. But "if God's word is not to be credited when without reservation" or *exception* it promises "everlasting life" to *any* and *every* man that complies with the terms of the gospel, then the promises of those who *have* repented, and *have* believed are just as likely to fail, so far as I can see, of being fulfilled.

You think my explanation of Isa. 24 : 21, 22, and 26 : 14, as applicable to Rev: 20 :—the prophet being carried in vision to the day of judgment—"looks very much like the work of imagination"—and you suppose I am wrong because I make the fulfillment of 26 : 14—come *before* the resurrection as brought to view in verse 19—"Thy dead men *shall live*, together with my dead body shall they arise." "Does all this," you say, "look like being a parallel with Rev. 20? And is it to be said, *after* the wicked die "the second death," "thy dead men *shall* live, together with my dead body shall they arise?"

In answer I will ask my brother if he does not know that *this* is a *discursive* prophecy wherein no attention is paid to the chronological order? That it is so, is evident from the fact that verses 20, 21 are to have a fulfillment *before* the resurrection which is brought to view in the preceding verse, so that if chronological order were observed, the 19th verse should come after verses 20, 21.—That I am correct here in regard to the events of verses 20, 21, and their order, is established by Dan. 12 : 1, where the same time of trouble is spoken of, and that the people of God should be delivered from it, &c., and then follows in the next verse an account of the resurrection in regular chronological order. This same time of trouble is spoken of at length in Jer. 25 : and certainly takes place before the resurrection, as do the seven last plagues which probably relate to the same thing.

Isa. 43 : 14–17, I do not think is parallel to Isa. 26 : 14. The expressions, "*They shall not rise, they are extinct*—they are quenched as tow"—have reference only to the fact, as the reader will see by looking at the connection, that THE ARMY spoken of as coming from Babylon with the *horses* and *chariots* thereof, should be *utterly overthrown* and *destroyed*, so that *as* an *army* they should "*not rise*" again, being entirely "*extinct*, and quenched as tow." It is surpassing strange that Br. S. can let such passages as this and Isa. 26 : 14, out-weigh and render void the plain teaching of Christ, John 5 : 28, 29, and the teaching of the

apostle, 1 Cor. 15; &c., not to say anything about the *general tenor* of God's word on this point.

Your answer, to my argument that the wicked are to be "destroyed *together*," and not one at a time, I will now notice. You quote the passage —"God * * * hath quickened us *together* with Christ, and hath raised us up together," &c.—to show that, "If this is to be applied to a literal resurrection, Christians were not quickened and raised up at the *same time* Christ was." Hence you say, that the expression "*raised up together*" simply means "a common benefit—that which is common to all of whom it is spoken, with no idea that all receive the blessing, or blessings, at one and the same time. So the common destiny of all mankind," you argue, "is, to be destroyed—they are destroyed together—their destiny is one—it is common to them all; not that every individual sinner is destroyed at the same time, any more than * * * that they (the apostles and their converts) all had their resurrection from the dead at the same time Christ had his, because 'quickened *together with him*." In reply to this, it is only necessary to state that the Greek word employed in the passage you quote as explanitory of my proof text, is *suzoopoyeo* and is translated by the words "*hath quickened together with*," and doubtless means as you say, "simply a common benefit—that which is common to all of whom it is spoken," &c. Now the Hebrew word *yakhad* rendered *together*, and used in the passages I quoted to prove that the wicked are not punished *one at a time* as they die according to your view, does not mean what *suzoopoyeo* does in the Greek; if it does, then I have the positive proof that the wicked *must* have a *resurrection* in order to be destroyed, for I find on turning to my lexicon that *suzoopoyeo* means, "to *recall to life, together with, or as another*"—hence it is translated "*quickened together with*"—while *yakhad* translated *together*, means simply "in company," as "we walked *together* to the wood," i. e., at the *same time* in company. Hence the passages I quoted as proof on this point are still unscathed and remain in full force, so that it is true as the Bible itself that "the DESTRUCTION of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be TOGETHER; and they that forsake the Lord shall be CONSUMED," not with "*death*," but with FIRE. I cannot think my dear brother would desire to employ *such* an argument as he has, to do away with the *force* of the above plain text, in order to defend, or even *save* his doctrine from an overthrow, if he knew or *thought* it founded in error.

I am astonished at my brother's reply to 2 Peter, 2: 9, as it does away entirely with the burning, thrilling truth, (which has arrested the minds of millions and moved them to repentance)—that "God hath appointed a day in the which to judge the world": for if this language of Peter—"The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to RESERVE the unjust unto *the day of judgment to be punished*"—does not refer to a day of future judgment, where "the dead small and great," *good* and *bad*, are to appear and give an account unto God for the deeds done in the body—then no passage in the Bible has reference to such a day; and Universalists are right in contending that all the judgment there is to be, is now going on, and men are receiving their punishment every day.

Do I understand my brother as denying that there will be a day of judgment in the future when the wicked will be judged and punished? I infer this from the following language: "The whole connection of 2 Peter 2: 9," he says, "shows that the apostle had no such idea in his mind as that of the wicked *dead* being reserved to a future day of judgment to be punished." Again, "Peter had reference *only* to the living wicked, who shall no more escape the *judgment* of *death*" [*not the judgment* DAY then?] "than the old world or Sodom did. God would reserve, hold, or keep them to that judgment," [i. e., that they should not escape natural death,] "and they shall be brought to the *grave and remain in the tomb*, after the ensample Peter spoke of." If I misapprehend your language, I trust you will correct me. I hope I do, for I should be very sorry for the sake of the precious and glorious truths you have so long and so ably advocated, to have it understood that you entirely ignore a *future judgment day*. Howeyer it may be, I am satisfied this is the tendency of the doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked dead.

Again you say, "Each of the *figurative* expressions, which Br. H. thinks will not be fulfilled, if our view is correct, have their ample fulfillment all in one word—*extermination*, or *annihilation*. As fire devours and utterly destroys combustible matter cast into it, or on which it feeds, and cannot be restored, so *death* devours and annihilates all those out of Christ." The question is not whether the wicked will be "*exterminated* or *annihilated*," as we both believe this; but HOW will they be *annihilated?* is the question. The Bible is very uniform in its expressions, that they will be *consumed*, not with *death*, (and it would have been just as easy to have said *death* if IT was meant) but with FIRE—they shall be BURNED UP with UNQUENCHABLE FIRE—BURNED UP *root* and *branch*, &c. If this be true, then "*death* doth" *not* "devour and annihilate all them out of Christ," for the FIRE that *is to come down, is coming down every* day when a wicked man dies, but is *to* come down from God out of heaven DEVOURS them, and consequently they *die* "*the second death*": but *death* is not the agent by which they are *devoured —destroyed—annihilated*, any more than *death* is the *agent* which destroys a *man* who is *burned up* in a building that is consumed by the fiery element—the *fire* is the *cause* of death in both cases. Again, if my brother is right, the wicked *must* be annihilated in *hades*—must forever remain there; but the revelator says, "*death* and *hades* delivered up the dead which were in them, and they were judged *every man* according to their works." The wicked *must* have a resurrection from *hades* in order to fulfil the plain teaching of Christ that they are to be cast into *Gehenna*. If it be said that those only who live when Christ comes, are to be cast into *Gehenna*, I reply that Christ settles this question in the following language. Math. 23: 29, 33, "Wo unto you Scribes

and Pharisees, hypocrites! * * * Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, HOW can YE escape the damnation of GEHENNA"? My brethren who believe in the non-resurrection of the wicked can answer this question of Christ put to the Pharisees, by simply saying that they will forever remain in *hades*, therefore there is no danger of their being cast into *Gehenna*. But it is certain from this language of Christ that *those very Pharisees cannot* escape the *fires* of *Gehenna*. Consequently it follows they *must* have a resurrection from "*death and hades*." Hence I believe there is no argument or explanation that can do away with this difficulty that stands in the way of your view. Hades contrary to your opinion yields up *all* that is in it, at the word of the Son of God, for he alone "has the keys of *death* and *hades*," and has unequivocally declared that "ALL that are in the graves SHALL HEAR HIS VOICES and come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, [eternal] and THEY that have done evil unto the RESURRECTION of damnation." If the wicked dead are never to have a resurrection, Jesus Christ would never have uttered such language as this—no—never. And my dear brother, all the time spent, all the arguments concocted, all the explanations made or that can be made, all the passages quoted from Genesis to Revelations, can never overthrow or render null and void these *most positive* and most truthful words of our common Master and Redeemer.

Yours fraternally,

H. H. HALL.

[See response, page 168.]

Prospects of the Jews in Palestine.

Our readers are aware that in the spring of 1854, a touching appeal was made in London, as elsewhere, to good-hearted people of all faiths, to save the remnant of the Jews in Palestine from perishing by famine. The appeal was responded to, and in February of last year a report was published by the chief Rabbi in London and Sir Moses Montefiore, the Trustees of the Relief Fund, detailing the methods in which relief had been administered. Their second report appeared recently, and the London *Daily News* gives the following outline of its contents:

"Sir Moses Montefiore and his lady, and a few friends, went out to Palestine in May last. The Sultan and his Ministers at Constantinople granted all that was asked in furtherance of the main object of the Trustees—the establishment of industrial pursuits in Palestine, and especially of tillage of the land. A Jew, introduced by Christian dignitaries to a Mussulman potentate, and going from regal presence with protection—and, above all, protection to agricultural industry—in his hand, is a new spectacle in the world. Less novelty there was in Sir. M. Montefiore's painful discovery, on reaching Jerusalem, that he was looked for as an infallible deliverer, 'many having supposed that Sir Moses had the power to relieve from every ill, and to provide for every want.' This was likely to happen with an Eastern people, looking for especial intervention on all occasions; and with a people habitually sustained by alms, who conclude it to be every body's business 'to provide for every want' they are subject to. Sir Moses and his friends had two objects, however, of which alms giving was the first in pressure, but not in importance. They relieved the existing hunger; but they were even more anxious to cut off the sources of distress—to induce the people to depend on their own industry, and not on European or American alms. In the consultations held at Jerusalem, with representatives from the other three holy cities, there was what appears to us, with our biblical notions of Jewish proceedings, a curious mingling of topics. The Needlewomen's Assciation and the Lying-in and Loan Societies were discussed, examined, and approved; a Girl's School was determined on; and then came in the old imagery of the vine and the fig-tree, the placing of landmarks, and the gathering together of flocks and herds. Under the advice of practical agriculturists, convened in council, land was bought on which thirty-five families from Szaffad were planted in one place, and thirty from Tabarea in another; and others again from Hebron, and others from Jaffa. It is noticable that the inhabitants of the two holy cities near the Lake of Tiberias are not required to give up their privileged residence. In both cases land has been obtained at hand, so that they are still on the spot whenever the looked-for uprising from the Lake of the Messiah takes place. West of Jerusalem a tract of land has been obtained; and there the people are to show what they can do, under the express protection of the Porte. The deputation declare their impression to be, that their poor brethren are as willing as able to work. If so, *the present crisis will be the opening of a new period in Hebrew history.*

"When the deputation opened their Girl's School, on the very first day 144 attended, and 400 were registered. In the school the industrial aim is kept in view; and the pupils are taught domestic management, dress-making, and embroidery. 'Several bales of calico' have been sent out since the return of the deputation, to afford work for the schools, and clothing for the necessitous. All these details wear a very modern appearance; but the most striking to biblical readers is one which is indeed positively startling.—Sir Moses intends 'to send out materials for the creation of a wind-mill, with the view to supercede the expensive method used at Jerusalem for grinding corn.' Farewell, then, the mill where two women may be grinding—the mill which abides in the eastern traveler's memory as the most characteristic centre of a group that his days journey presented him. For two women grinding at the mill there will be seen the dusty miller. Well, the Arabs will preserve the *guhern*, if the Levant breezes serve ever so well for the Jewish windmill. If the old usages carry away with them in desuetude the old burdens, the mortgages of synagogue, burial grounds, and houses, Sir Moses might well be welcome in Palestine, whatever novelties he might carry in his train. It is pleasant to see something of the ancient character of speech preserved, as when we find the Trustees saying that

whatever they have hitherto done 'is but the rolling away of the stone from the well's mouth.'—Others, they hope, will lend aid to draw the reviving waters from the depths. It really seems as though the war undertaken for the defence of the Turks was to open a new career to the Jew."—*The Presbyterian.*

The following is an Editorial from the same paper, and we give it most cheerfully, and rejoice in the good Mrs. MINOR was instrumental in effecting.—ED. EXR.

PALESTINE.—We particularly direct the reader's attention to an article on the first page, entitled "Prospects of the Jews in Palestine." It affords some glimpses of the spirit which has been awakened in behalf of the Palestine Jews. Whatever is in progress through the instrumentality of Sir Moses Montefiore or others, in restoring the cultivation of Palestine by Jewish labor, be it remembered, is to be traced to the extraordinary and self-sacrificing efforts of Mrs. Minor, who may in truth be said to have fallen a martyr to the privations and labors which she voluntarily encountered for the hope of Israel.* Persons professing to have the spirit of Christ may sneer at her fanaticism, and after she has fallen at her post triumphing in her Saviour, may, for reasons best known to themselves, endeavor to blast her fair fame; but posterity will do her justice as the pioneer in one of the most remarkable enterprises which benevolence and Christian principle ever suggested. For five long years she labored under the most disheartening discouragements, and verified her predictions that the soil of Palestine might again be made fertile, and that, too, by Jewish labor. For this the Jews in this country, in England, and in Palestine, reverence her memory. Sir Moses Montefiore has given public testimony to her worth and to the value of her experiment. He earnestly wished her to cultivate the land he had bought, and to give instruction to the Jews he should employ, promising ample means. As a token of his confidence, two letters were received at the mission a few weeks after her death, making her an unconditional contribution of seven hundred and fifty dollars. But she had gone beyond the reach of such favors, and we had hoped with a memory sacred against cruel asperations.

* We have the testimony of one present on the occasion, that in a personal interview between Sir Moses Montefiore and Mrs. Minor, (the English and American Consuls and other distinguished persons being also present) Sir Moses addressing Mrs. Minor in the kindest terms, said to her, "Mrs Minor, it is by your example, and by that alone, that I have been induced to do anything for my brethren in the way of agriculture. Let the Biarrah (which he had just purchased) not be called after my name, but still be called Mrs. Minor's, as it has always been."

THERE are only a very few Subscribers of the EXAMINER who have not paid for the entire volume. All who have not, we trust, will do so immediately.

GLORYING IN THE LORD.

BY S. R. N.

"Thus saith the Lord: Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom; neither let the mighty man glory in his might; let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me; that I am the Lord, which exercise loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth; for in these I delight, saith the Lord."—JER. ix. 23, 24.

It is our intention—seeing that we may lawfully glory in the knowledge of the "Most High"—to indicate a few particulars in which the position occupied by the Christian is so greatly superior to that held by the children of the world, who know not God,—that abundant cause to rejoice greatly, and to glory in our God, will be at once manifest.

1. What says the Spirit of God respecting those who were living without God, or who "did not like to retain the knowledge of him in their hearts?" They were "given over to a reprobate heart," and to practices unfit to be named: living in the practice of "murder, debate, deceit; hating God; without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful."—(Rom. i.) History and observation tell us the same story "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God;" but it is still more dreadful and destructive to be living "without him" in the world.

Well, then, *we* may glory in knowing that God desires not the death of the sinner; nor that mankind should be left in such a deplorable condition. How glorious to *know* the sublime truth, that the everlasting God "so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever should believe in him might not perish, but have everlasting life!"—To know that God has checked man in his guilty career by a display of love to which, until then, man had been a stranger! We may well glory in this, and in the possession of those precious promises—the free gift of God! By these we are delivered from mental and moral slavery, and made to stand erect and free, with thoughts and desires stretched out towards the author of our being—our heavenly Father! It is indeed a glorious thing to know that our God needs not, as the idols of the heathen, to be propitiated with slaughter! Idolaters have sacrificed to their false deities whole hecatombs of their fellow-creatures, in order to propitiate them; but Jehovah gave up *his Son* to death that he might destroy the enemy of the human mind, and render *man* placable! "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." Jesus became *one* with us, that he might declare his Father's love and exemplify his character: and *now* we know God no longer as a dark and mighty abstraction, infinitely removed from our sphere of existence; but, as loving and pitying us, and remembering that we are but dust. Let him that will glory, glory in the Lord that bought him.

2. God has forgiven, and does forgive us, our iniquities. Well may we rejoice and glory! How much of peace and solid comfort is conferred upon us by this gift! If, when on bad terms with our fellow-men, we suffer distress, anxiety, or remorse, and view every act of the person with whom we are at variance in a distorted light, how dreadful

would be the sense of sin unpardoned by God? How dreadful to be at variance with Jehovah, and view *him* as hostile! Insanity and suicide have resulted from an impression that sin had transcended the power of forgiveness: Judas is an example of this. But forgiveness is above and about *us*; we live in an atmosphere of pardon; and it will be our own fault if we do not realize its blissful power.

3. Again; we may glory in the knowledge of God's omnipresence and continual oversight over all his works. The *old* idolaters used to seek their gods in hills and dales, in caves and groves; the modern ones seek him whom they desire to worship in temples of wood and stone, in images, pictures, and even in a little paste! They seek, and of course do not find! And what wisdom is in them? Not enough to enable them even to discern their own deep degradation. Blessed be God, we know, and glory in the knowledge, that although "the heaven of heavens cannot contain him," God is present in the heart of his humblest worshipper, as well as everywhere present; therefore also we will not fear what men can do unto us. No one can take God at unawares, for "he neither slumbers nor sleeps." The eternity of God's ominipresence and superintending power tends to keep our consciences sensitive, and to spur us on to the exercise of a most unspeakable privilege, that is, of drawing near to God in prayer!

4. Prayer may be called the breath of our spiritual life. The Christian could not live without it. Oh! that we could more properly appreciate its surpassing exceellence! We are all familiar with the impassioned language in which David was wont to pour out his soul to God. It has been supposed that these Psalms are in reality the burning words and index of the thoughts and feelings of David's Son and Lord; and surely it is so! We know but little of the early life of Jesus, and of his secret intercommunication with God his Father, except as it is revealed in the spiritual heart-breathings of the sweet Psalmist of Israel. If it be so, we perceive how Jesus valued and exercised the privilege of prayer—how he *thus* shows us an example. *We* know how our joys are increased and our griefs lessened by being poured out into a sympathetic ear: but God has promised to be to us more than friend, brother, or wife can ever be. This privilege highly exalts us. An appeal to an earthly monarch has to pass through ranks of obstructing officials with many formalities, and then perhaps does not reach the throne; but the King of kings stoops to receive the petition of the meanest of his subjects: "there is no respect of persons with God." If a sparrow falls not to the ground without him, how much more will he not preserve us, and remove, if need be, our troubles from us.

CANTICLE BY STEAM.—The thing is done! there is no use in talking "can't" to a Yankee; the idea of music by steam is fully realized, and is none of your screeching, howling, bellowing whistles, but genuine, melodious, scientific music, produced by Stoddard's Musical Steam Whistle—we call it whistle, but it is really a steam piano, or organ and music box, and by steam alone, tunes are played with all the sharps, flats, crotchets, minims, rests, quavers, demi-semi quavers, and everything else pertaining to marches, waltzes, operas, polkas, airs, psalm tunes, and even ballads and songs—except the words.

We sat in our sanctum on Friday evening, about 9 o'clock, wearily but busily engaged in furnishing copy, when our ears were saluted with strains of music, loud, clear and somewhat singular; the Marseilles Hymn, Life on the Ocean Wave, Sweet Home, Susannah don't you cry, Old Hundred, Old Dog Tray, Flow gently sweet Afton, and a full programme of other pieces followed each other in quick succession. All the city heard the music, and for five miles round the air was full of the melody. Everybody wondered what band it was, or what instrument had waked up, and one old lady thought the Angel Gabriel had come with the "last trump!"

But it soon became known that it was Stoddard's Patent Steam Musical Instrument that had waked the echoes of the valley and serenaded the ancient city of Worcester. We saw the machine Saturday, and examined its mechanism. It is simple, yet ingenious and beautiful, and the great question in regard to it is settled; it will execute tunes, and when completed, for upon this one there are as yet but eleven keys, will discourse music to order, that can be distinctly heard five miles on land or twenty miles on the water. It is double in its construction, so that it can be played by a performer like an organ, or when set to a particular tune will "go alone" as long as you like. We will not here attempt a description of this most novel and now successful invention. It will not be many weeks, before our friends in various parts of the country who have doubted and laughed at the idea of "music by steam" will have an opportunity to satisfy themselves by the hearing of the ear, that the thing is a fixed fact.

We clipped the foregoing from the *Worcester Daily Transcript*, of April 14. If "*the thing is done*" we rejoice in it, for two reasons. First: the *Inventor* is a worthy man, and strong on *immortality* only as the *gift* of God, and not inherrent. Second: we are tired of the horrid *screaching* of Rail-road and Steam-boat *whistles*. Till we can get better music under the reign of MESSIAH, success to Br. J. C. STODDARD's "*Musical* Steam Whistle."

CANTON, *Ill.*—A Subscriber in that place asks us to change his paper to *Keokuck*, Iowa: but as he forgot to give his name we cannot comply till he does, as we have four subscribers at Canton and know not which wishes the change.

OUR SUBSCRIBERS who have paid but $1, on the present volume, will remember that one number more is all they are entitled to for that sum.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, June 1, 1856.

Response to Bro. Hall's Third Rejoinder.

Bro. HALL and ourself differ in opinion as to the true rendering of the preposition *en*, 1 Cor. 15 : 22; and there seems no probability that we shall come to an agreement. He thinks he has "conclusively shown" that *by* expresses "the undoubted meaning of the" apostle; but we are unfortunately *entirely* of a different opinion; and on our mind there is not the shade of a doubt that its true sense is *in;* but we cannot consent on our part to fill any more space on that point. We cannot blame Br. H. for laboring so earnestly to sustain a different translation, for if *in* is the true sense of the apostle it strips the advocates of the *re-living* of the wicked dead of everything like "*positive* testimony" in support of their theory.

We cannot afford to travel over again and again the same ground we have in our previous responses. We ask the reader to take our last response (April 15) and compare with Bro. H's. present rejoinder as he proceeds. Let him especially read the first paragraph on page 123, and see if we have not there "conclusively shown"—when taken with our previous rejoinder—that *by* is utterly inadmissible in verse 22, in the phrase "*in Christ.*"

Our brother mistakes our meaning if he supposes we "acknowledge that the changing of *in* to *by* is not critically wrong in verse 22." If our language would bear that construction it certainly was not the sense we intended to convey.—We believe it is "critically wrong" to translate it *by;* and that it does violence to the apostle's entire argument in that chapter; and makes Paul to say "*nay*" to the Romans and "*yea*" to the Corinthians; while he affirms his preaching was not "*yea and nay.*" See again our remarks of April 15, p. 123 referred to above.

Br. H. urges, u on us, again, the expression "even so," in verse 22; and says, "it does have reference and only reference to the *transgression* of *Adam* which brings death to *all*, and to the *resurrection* of *Christ* which brings *life* to *all;*" and he adds—"*eternal life* to the *righteous*, but only *temporary life* to the wicked."

This phrase, "temporary life," is about as convenient as that of "immortal soul," and about as scriptural, *i. e.* neither have any place in the Bible. Our Lord Jesus declares, "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have *no life* in you;" and this is said in direct reference to life after death, "at the last day;" and he never once tells any man that he shall have a "temporary life" after death. No, not one such announcement is made in the Bible. It is easy to make inferences, and we think our immortal soul believers can just as easy infer immortality to all men, as it can be inferred that some men will have a "temporary life" from the dead. Not one word is said of any life after death in 1 Cor. 15, except one of "glory, incorruptibility, immortality:" of that fact we have no more doubt than we have that "the dead shall be raised *incorruptible.*" Br. H. thinks otherwise; and we esteem him none the less for that; we believe him to be just as sincere and honest as we claim to be; but it is utterly impossible for us to adopt his view of that chapter. Our view of it was established before we ever thought of the question whether the wicked dead would live again; and all we have ever read has only tended to confirm us in it. All those "*in* Christ" and who fall asleep, or die in him, have death as a natural result of being *in* Adam the first: the same all who *thus* die—that is, fall asleep in Jesus—are made alive *in* Christ by the *Spirit* that raised him up from the dead.—"*If* the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall *also* quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." There is no other way to obtain a revival from the dead into life. So we believe. The mere fact of Christ's *resurrection* secures no man's revival into life unless he is first delivered from his sins, by a remission of them, so that the Spirit of God dwells in his heart. This constitutes a living union with the living *Life-Giver*, and secures a re-living to all who possess this indwelling Spirit.

Br. H. proceeds to remark on what we said, that on this theory "Christ is manifested to be the greatest curse to the wicked dead," &c. He says, "Christ was manifested to be a blessing to *all* who comply with the terms of the gospel, but not *in any sense* to them that wickedly reject his mercy and do despite to the Spirit of his grace." We think Christ is a blessing to all men in *some* "*sense:*" but he neither blesses nor curses the wicked dead with a revival into life, which would be "the greatest curse" imaginable, and is the result of "Christ's resurrection" according to Bro. H's. theory, though he endeavors to avoid such conclusion. He saith this greatest curse "does not come upon the sinner in consequence of the resurrection of Christ, but because of their *rejec-*

tion of Christ." Now, the largest portion of sinners never heard of Christ, and consequently never personally *rejected* him. Hence if *such* are to be raised to life, by Christ's resurrection—as Br. H. maintains—and never would have been made alive but for Christ—and if that life is *only* to be tormented and killed again—we ask, if Christ is not "the greatest curse" to all such that can be imagined? "They *might* and *ought* to have avoided the 'terrible' punishment denounced against them in the Scriptures of truth," saith our brother. The vast majority of sinners never heard of the "Scriptures," nor of their denunciations—they never heard of Christ. Yet, according to Br. H. they are "*all* to be made alive *by* Christ"—tormented hopelessly, and burned up in gehenna's fire for not "*avoiding*" that of which they never heard. And all this comes "*by* Christ." Br. H. may honestly believe all this, and yet think these sinners are not *cursed* in his view of their "resurrection *by* Christ;" but to us, on such a view, we confess we are more than ever convicted that the revival into life of all the wicked dead, for such a purpose as the advocates of Br. H's. side of the question suppose, makes Christ's coming into the world a far greater curse than blessing; and it is to be the cause of a positive amount of sin and blasphemy of which earth's history, for six thousand years, bears no comparison: sin which would not have been known but for the revival into life of all the wicked dead; which event Br. H. has admitted would never have occurred but for the resurrection of Christ. Again we say, this view seems to us to make "Christ the minister of sin."

Br. H. in his peculiarly descriptive style sets off the punishment of the wicked dead, revived into life, repudiating "some fancy law," and fixing on the law which "emenated from Mount Sinai" as that by which they are to be tormented and burned in *gehenna*. The largest portion of the inhabitants of earth never heard of *that law;* and that law saith not one word of a revival into life of those who die under its curse. We ask the reader to look at the response to Bro. Grew on this topic in the EXAMINER for October last year. No threatening of punishment in a life after death is even hinted in the Sinaic Law, nor in the details as drawn out by Moses afterwards. Let this fact be remembered.

As to "*Gehenna,*" let the reader examine what was said in the discussion with Bro. Grew on the use of the phrase. See last vol. pages 301, 363. He will see, we think, that the term has no such meaning as Bro. H. attaches to it.

Bro. H. says "the sinner is to be made alive and tormented awhile to satisfy the law of God for *personal* transgressions." Indeed: then the wages of sin is *not* death but torment; and if the sinner must be made alive and tormented, some time must elapse for that torment to be accomplished. During that time he will be multiplying his sins; and if God's law is unchangable it will require an additional period to torment the sinner for the sins he commits while undergoing his first season of torment; and then another, and another, till "*eternal torments*" become inevitable, unless a period can be fixed when the law holds not the sinner responsible for "*personal* transgressions," which is not to be admitted. The fact is, our friends will all find, before long, that this notion, of justice's requiring sinners to be made alive from the dead to be *tormented*, will drive them back, to the old theory of endless sin and suffering. They may think not; but we are sure it will if they follow out their premises to their legitimate conclusion. Sin will never cease to be sin, whether committed in this life or another; and if torment is the wages of sin, in whole or in part, then every sin must be visited with torment, and it is necessarily *endless*. So we are satisfied it will be made to appear by our opponents; for here will yet be their grand point of attack, *viz:* the necessity of torment in another life to meet the claims of law. Let Br. H. and all on his side of the question mark what we here say: we *know* whereof we speak. No positive infliction of pain beyond the grave, for the sins of this life, or an eternal infliction of it for continuance in sin, hereafter, is to be the battle field shortly; and all the advocates of *life only* through Christ who admit torment as the penalty in whole or in part, in another life, will find they have a harder conflict to pass in this battle than they have ever seen before; and many of them we fear will find themselves swept away in the *torment* current into their old belief of eternal torments. We see no chance for their escape except by the plain truth that he who "believeth not the Son *shall not see life*, but the wrath of God *abideth* on him;" John 3 : 36, hence, he has no revival into any life; for he has "*no life*" in him: John 6 : 53.

Our brother asks, "if Adam's death is eternal—Christ not affecting him—and his posterity that reject Christ die in the same sense, does it not certainly follow on this hypothesis, that the wicked are under the same law that Adam was, and suffer precisely the same penalty, and *that* not because of their *own* transgressions, but because of

ADAM'S transgressson? for *through his* transgression *death* came into the world!" Br. H. adds—"Here is something for my brother to harmonize with his view. Can he do it? we shall see."

Br. H. shall "see" that we "can do it" without a mighty effort. Because the wicked "die in the same sense" Adam did, it does "*not* follow" that they now live "under the same law that Adam" did as a ground of life or death, by no means.—That they "suffer precisely the same penalty" Adam did does not prove them under the same law, though the penalty—for their refusal to be led to *repentance* by "the goodness of God," manifested under their dispensation—*is the same:* "they which commit such things are worthy of *death;*" Rom. 1: 32. The Adamic law admitted of no repentance—of no renewed obedience—*one* transgression was final; but the law under which his posterity were placed admits of the free remission of "many offences;" and in consequence to be justified unto life, so as not to die as did Adam, or in "the same sense;" while those who do not improve their dispensation do die as did Adam, and that "because of their *own* transgressions," and not because of ADAM'S. The death that "came into the world" *through* his transgression—*i. e.* upon his posterity—was a *calamity*, not a punishment. It was a calamity from which they might recover through the second Adam; but rejecting him, or by not acting up to the light and requirements of their dispensation—whether pagan, patriarchal, Jewish, or Christian—they come under death, not merely as a calamity, but as a punishment for their "personal transgressions:" death irrevocable is the penalty of sin under every and all dispensations: for "the wages of sin is death:" Rom. 6: 23.—This is the "second death:" not dying *twice;* but a death essentially different from that to which all were subjected as a calamity: it is a *penal* death; and hence second in its nature and consequences: because from it there is no recovery—*they* "shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them."

Our "questions," as to the circumstances of Adam's probation, do not and cannot "apply to Abel, Seth, Enos, &c." They were brought into life and probation under a new dispensation, after Adam's had terminated and his Judge had set in judgment on him and pronounced his doom. If our brother "knows of no special promise made directly to them, that *they* should have *an Advocate with the Father* in case they sinned," he *knows* or may know, that these men—"Abel, Seth, Enos, &c."—had "faith" and "obtained witnesses" that they were accepted, "God *testifying* of Abel's gifts:" which leaves us in no doubt of their dispensation being entirely different; for we never hear of Adam's *faith*, or of God's testifying of his gifts.

We shall not call in question Br. H's. right to "think" the statement of the seed of the woman bruising the serpent's head "related to the whole human family;" and he must allow us to "think" it related to just what it says, *viz*: the *woman's* "*seed.*" If Adam was the woman's seed then it "related to" him, not otherwise. Adam's personal doom immediately follows the prophecy of the victory of the woman's seed over the serpent: and that doom was death, with no intimation that it should ever be revoked for any cause. There revelation leaves Adam, and there we leave him, *because* revelation does.

Br. H.'s ideas of "*discursive* prophecy" does not meet the case in Isa. 26: 14, 19. That this is such a prophecy, he says "is evident from the fact that verses 20, 21, are to have a fulfilment *before* the resurrection which is brought to view in the preceding verse, so that if chronological order were observed the 19th verse should come after verse 20, 21." Now, we dissent entirely from this view; nor does the reference to Dan. 12: 1 prove it; for that prophecy speaks of deliverance to "thy people" from the trouble; hence as the living saints are to be delivered from that time of trouble the sleeping ones must have had their resurrection immediately prior to it, as those who are asleep in Jesus are to rise *first*, before the living are changed, and caught up to meet the Lord in the air: 1 Thess. 4: 16, 17. Hence, in our opinion, Isa. 26: 19, 20 and 21 are in their proper chronological order. "Thy dead men shall live," &c. Then they—when made alive—are called to enter into their chambers until the indignation is overpast; or while God "punishes the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity," &c. This corresponds with our Lord's words Luke 21, where speaking of the things coming on men at the time the kingdom of God is at hand, he says—"Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to ESCAPE *all these things* that shall come to pass, and to *stand before the Son of Man;*" verse 36. Here is the same chronological order that is found in Isa. 26: 19, 20, 21. The living saints are changed, the dead ones are revived into life, and all are caught up to meet the Lord in the air—they enter into their "chambers"—and *escape* those judgments that then fall

on the wicked "inhabitants of the earth." Br. H.'s view keeps the poor saints here to share in the trouble and punishment; but Christ promises they shall "*escape*" it, and "stand before" him. Our previous argument, on Isa. 26, thus stands unmoved and immoveable.

Br. H. has taken a very brief notice of Isa. 43: 14–17, and thinks the text means "*as* an *army* they should 'not rise' again being entirely 'extinct' and quenched as tow." We presume they will not rise again "*as* an *army*," for the very good reason that "they"—including the "*nobles*" at Babylon—are "extinct" to live no more.

Br. H. adds—"It is surpassing strange that Br. S. can let such passages as this and Isa. 26: 14, outweigh and render void the plain teaching of Christ, John 5: 28, 29, and the teaching of the apostle 1 Corth. 15: &c.,—not to say anything about the general tenor of God's word on this point."

We only "let such passages outweigh and render void" Br. H.'s *construction* of John 5: 28, 29, and 1 Cor. 15; because his construction is an inference which is at war with *positive* texts against the revival *into life* of the wicked dead; and equally at war with the "general tenor of God's word," in our opinion. Not one solitary text has he which positively and plainly states the wicked dead shall live again: no, not one. 1 Corth, 15: 22 is not such a text, in our judgment; and whoever is convinced it is, can only be consistent by embracing universal salvation. So we think.

B. H.'s critical remarks on "destroyed together" fail to produce any conviction on our mind that all wicked men are to be destroyed *at once;* and *yakhad* must have the *necessary* sense of *at once* to be available to his view; but it has not necessarily that sense. It occurs in Psa. 14: 3, "They are all gone aside, they are all *together* become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no not one." Paul quotes this language, Rom. 3: 12, making it of universal application to men living in different periods of the world—"They are all gone out of the way, they are *together* become unprofitable."—Hence, it is seen that Br. H.'s construction of the expression is not its undoubted sense. We will say nothing in defence of our previous illustration by the phrase "quickened us together with Christ," Eph 2: 5, by urging Isa. 26: 19—where the language, in our translation is, "Thy dead men shall live, *together* with my dead body shall they arise," which perfectly harmonizes with Paul's language, Eph. 2: 5—because it might be said, together is not in the original, though it seems manifestly to be the meaning of the prophecy. Br. H., however, may be assured that *we* shall never stake the *truth* of "the Bible itself" upon our construction of language, as *he* has done on this point.

Br. H.'s astonishment at our construction of 2 Pet. 2: 9, is reciprocated by ourself at his amazing assumption, that if that text does not refer to a future judgment, where the *dead* good and bad are to appear, &c., then no text in the Bible does, and "Universalists are right." Just let the reader turn to our remarks on the subject, April 15, page 126. As to his inference from our language on that text we repudiate it. His throwing into our language his brackets—"[*i. e.*, that they should not escape natural death]"—we think was not called for; at any rate we do not admit his construction of our words; nor do we believe the wicked who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord will die a "natural death," any more than the men of Sodom did, of whom Peter spake. Nor do we believe any impenitent sinner, strictly speaking, dies a natural death. "The wicked is DRIVEN away in his wickedness"; they "are overthrown, and *are not;*" see Prov. 12: 7 and 14: 32. Their death, as we have said before, is a *penal* death: they die *not* a natural death—they die under the *curse* of the law—their sins all upon them—"in their sins"—unpardoned; and Christ himself cannot lift them from that curse of the law unless he first "taketh away their sins." He cannot interfere with the claims of the law in any other manner. So we believe. If Br. H. thinks we "*ignore a future judgment day*," let him turn to vol. 10, pp. 318, 319, and he will learn what he seems never to have read.

The righteous, *only*, die a *natural* death—their death is *not* a penal one; it is the natural result of a connection with Adam the first; and as *in* him they "all die, even so IN *Christ* shall *they* all be made *alive;*" because *they* do not die "in their sins": such as die in their sins, Paul clearly states, "are perished": they go not in hades, merely, but into *gehenna* itself. Let the reader see again the remarks on "gehenna," vol. 10, pages 301, 363. The term is borrowed from the place of fire, constantly burning near Jerusalem, where all filth of the city and bodies of dead animals and malefactors were consumed; and is a *figurative* expression to denote an utter, entire, and irrecoverable destruction.

The coming of fire down from God out of heaven, Rev. 20, is on a specific class of sinners, *viz:* those who come up against the beloved city, who are of the Gog and Magog rebellion. If Br. H. be-

lieves that embraces any dead man made alive, we do not. It embraces *only* those living on the earth at the time spoken of, and who engage in that rebellion; and we will not differ with Br. H. that "they die the second death," but they do not die *twice*. The stress Br. H. puts upon the term *fire*, in all the texts he quotes in proof of what is the "*agent*" in the death of the wicked, shows that he feels the importance of such construction to the theory he advocates; but it fails to carry conviction to our mind that all wicked men are to be literally destroyed by fire; nor, as a general principle—applied to sinners—do we believe the Bible warrants any such construction of its language.

As to the judgment of the dead, spoken of Rev. 20: 11–15, let the reader see our remarks in present volume, page 6, and we think he will perceive in what sense death and hell deliver up their dead to be judged.

Br. H.'s argument on Math. 23: 29, 33, we regard as fully met in the reply to H. Grew, vol. 10, page 301. The *gehenna* fire is any such judgment as God shall inflict, that shall utterly destroy. Let the text and its context, Math. 23, be read and compared with Jer. 19, and we see no way of avoiding the conclusion that the generation of wicked Jews of our Saviour's time *were* cast into *gehenna*. *Tophet*, the valley of the son of Hinnom, Jer. 19, and *gehenna*, Math. 23: 33, are one and the same place; and the same subject is spoken of in both texts. The strength of Br. H.'s argument on this text proves to be his *opinion* of its meaning: whether that opinion is correct each reader will judge for himself; all we shall further say, is, "it is" *not* "*certain*" to us that he is correct.

Br. H. closes with pretty strong language; but we will look at it. He says—"Hades, contrary to your opinion, yields up all that is in it at the word of the Son of God, for he alone 'has the keys of death and *hades*,' and has unequivocally declared that "*all* that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth."

Observe first, the term *hades* is not in this text at all: it is not the word translated *graves*; it is, *mneemeivois*; which we can hardly suppose Jesus would have used if he meant *hades*.

Observe second, no *life* is spoken of as imparted to those who had done evil.

Observe third, Br. H.'s construction destroys the force and peculiarity of our Lord's language, Math. 16, where he saith, "the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against *my church*." That is nothing *peculiar* to his church according to Br. H.'s construction; for his theory is, that "the gates of hades shall not prevail against" the wicked dead: "*all* that is in it," he affirms, shall come out. But Jesus makes it *peculiar* to his church. To make it tally with our brother's theory it should read, "The gates of hades shall not prevail against any soul of man, saint or sinner"; for such is Br. H.'s construction of the matter.

Paul harmonizes with our Lord in his *peculiarity* about deliverance from hades: he says—"When this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death where is thy sting? O *hades* where is thy victory." 1 Corth. 15: 54, 55. Thus it is seen that a revival into *life* from *hades* is peculiar to the *good*; and that such only have that revival as put on incorruption and immortality. All others the law holds—not in hades, but in *gehenna*—in hopeless death: they were "driven away in their wickedness; but the righteous hath hope in his death."

Observe once more, Br. H.'s view is adverse to any peculiarity in the revival of Christ from the dead. "Thou wilt not *leave my soul in hades*," was the assurance of the Christ when he descended there. But what of that? no soul of man is to be left there, according to Br. H.; "*all* that is in it," according to his view "hades yields up." And he says, this is "contrary to your opinion." We believe it is equally "contrary" to the truth of God's word, if the wicked dead are in *hades* proper. We believe, however, that the wicked dead fall *below* hades; *i. e.*, they fall into *gehenna*, from which there is no revival into life.

Saith our brother, "Jesus Christ would never have uttered such language as this"—John 5: 28, 29—"if the wicked dead are never to have a resurrection." We have never called in question their resurrection in some sense, as Br. H. very well knows: but is it a revival into *life*? does their resurrection embrace *life*? The *positive* testimony of scripture, it appears to us, is against such a construction: and the general tenor of the word of truth is that *in* Christ, and in him *alone*, is there life from the dead; and that life is always, and everywhere, represented as *eternal*, and the subjects of it as *immortal*. But we shall not sit in judgment and undertake to determine what "Jesus Christ would never have uttered" if our opinions are not correct. We are, at the best, fallible beings, and may therefore be mistaken in

our construction of the words of scripture; specially where persons equally honest differ in opinion.

If Br. H.' innuendo at the close of his remarks is intended for us, we can assure him that we respect his *opinion*, but his arguments have produced no conviction on our mind; nor have *we* made any attempt to "overthrow and render null and void these *most positive* and most truthful words of our common Master and Redeemer." Br. H.'s *construction* of those words is another matter entirely. In our *opinion* there is no *positive* testimony that his construction is the true one. But if the whole subject is so clear on his side of the question, as his concluding *affirmation* implies, he will not need to discuss it further. We shall see whether he can afford to let "all the arguments, explanations," and "all the passages quoted from Genesis to Revelation" against his construction, or his theory, pass unnoticed. If he does, some change must have come over him. The strong and protracted effort he has made to sustain his view of 1 Corth. 15: 22, does not look much as if he thought there was no danger of his theory being destitute of one "*positive* testimony." It was on that *one* text our friendly and brotherly discussion commenced; but he has led off over much of the same ground of Br. Grew, which has caused our articles to be extended to greater length than is desirable, and compelled to a repetition which has not been so much prized by our readers who had the EXAMINER for last year, and more difficult to understand by those who had it not.

CHRIST DIED FOR US.

"But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

WE would sooner do and suffer any thing for others than die for them. When men, in their love and compassion for others, find that they are likely to perish themselves, they generally stop, then flee from the burning room, or shake off the drowning man, who by his grasp would prevent them from saving their own lives. Parents, husbands, wives, sometimes throw themselves into the arms of death impulsively, when they see a child or companion perishing, but a deliberate surrender of one's self to die to save another, is extremely rare. A man who is merely without reproach, a negative character, one with nothing strikingly good about him, can hardly awaken interest enough in others to die for him deliberately, leaving out of view sudden impulsive acts of heroism. Scarcely for a righteous man would one die, yet, peradventure, for a man with something positively interesting about him, for a good man, some would even dare to die. Still it is a rare case.—Men would say, I have a family, or, I am under obligations to others. If the best and most useful man were ready to die, and the question were asked, Who will die and save his life? which of us would be persuaded to make the substitution? If, weary of the world, one should consent, his motive would prevent his act from being an exception to what has now been said.

That we may see in what light we regard the substitution of one life for other lives, we will imagine the following case.

A crew escaped from a wreck on the high seas, have filled their boat to the water's edge, and occupied every possible place in it. Another survivor of the wreck swims up, boldly lays hold of the stern, and begs to be taken in. This unhappy being is yourself. With streaming eyes and voices choked with grief, they say, there is no room for you. Benumbed with holding on, you perceive that soon you must resign yourself to a watery grave. Then the sorrows of death compass you, and the pains of hell get hold upon you. One of the company feels unutterable compassion, and says to the rest, He shall take my place. What reason does he give? That man, he says, I have reason to believe is not prepared to die. My peace is made with God. If I save him from death, it may subdue him to repentance, and save his soul. The company refusing to take any responsibility in the case, the man leaps into the sea. He is irrecoverably gone, His place being vacant, you are drawn out of the sea, placed in his seat, and reach your home.

That man died for you. He bid farewell to all which was dear to him; in full health and strength he met the anguish of dying, gave up his body without a burial to be devoured in the deep, or wander in the currents of the ocean, or bleach on a strange shore. He chose to appear before his God, his probation terminated, to meet his unalterable doom. We will raise no question about the right of an individual thus to sacrifice his life. We are concerned now only with his act and his motive. His motive was purely benevolent. He saved your life to save your soul. You were a stranger to him till you sailed together, and he was under no obligation to you of any kind.

As you sat in your peaceful home, or lay on your bed, and oftentimes in your journeys, in your business, in all companies, the memory of that friend would affect you deeply. At the evening lamp, or in the night watches, as the blast pressed against your window, and your thoughts were directed to the sea and its perils, you would remember, A man died for me. The cup of suffering he took from my hand, and drank it himself. He pressed his way before me, and met the king of terrors, and turned that monster from me. I live by his death. All that I have is due to his love; it has been the means of my conversion to God; my eternity in heaven, under God, I owe to him.

What may we suppose you would do to signify your gratitude? Could you learn that there were relatives of his to whom you could show kindness, you would find it a relief to your feelings if you might help them. The family name of the man wherever you should meet it, would always thrill you.—

When the anniversary of your rescue came round, no day in the year would bring with it such thoughts and feelings. Ever-more this would be the impression upon your mind, A man died for me. To the grave of the ocean he voluntarily and deliberately went down, and saved me from death and hell.

How would it be if others with you were saved by this man? Would that lessen your love, and sense of obligation? Let us consider whether it would be so.

The boat, containing yourself and the whole of the crew, we will now suppose, was accidentally left fastened to the wreck. The end of the rope which is in the boat cannot by any means be severed; the wreck is settling and will soon go down, carrying with it all your company; they see that the end of the rope attached to the wreck can be cast off, but cannot be reached by the arm alone; some one must lift an instrument and push it off; the wind is blowing a gale, from the wreck; you have no oars, and the man who should push the rope from its fastening into the water must give up all expectation of returning to the boat, and will see it drift away, leaving him to die. Could he grasp the rope as it falls, he would be saved; but this is impossible. Time is wasting; the wreck give signs of sinking, when one of the company says, I will give my life for you all. He refuses the proposal to cast lots,—he cannot be restrained; and then, with an unutterable struggle of feeling on your part, you let him make the sacrifice. As he shakes hands with you severally, and that word, farewell, comes from you each in turn and all together, confused with a loud weeping, do you think that this mean thought would rise in your mind: After, all, I am indebted to him only my proportional share with the rest? No; if you had the heart of a human being, you would embrace him, saying, O my brother, will you die for me? The work is done, and as you drift away from him, leaving him on his coffin of a wreck, waving with his hand his farewell, and you finally see him engulphed and disappear, say, would you be willing to give up any part of your obligation, that it might be borne by another? Your constant declaration would be, He died for me.

All that has now been imagined has, for substance, but in an infinitely higher sense, been done for each of us.

Many think of Christ, and of their obligations to him, as they do, for example, of the services rendered by the patriots of their country to the whole people, but do not think of him as bestowing favor on them in particular, or expressly for each of them. This is erroneous, for it is the excellent glory and praise of Christ as a Saviour, that he is to every individual all which he can be to the race, and that every one can with as perfect truth appropriate his whole redeeming work, his birth, his sufferings, his death, his intercession, as though he alone were to be saved by Christ.

We admit that he died for all. "Behold the lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." These words, not to quote others like them, teach us that one human being is at least as much included in the benefits intended by the Saviour's death as another. God is no less the Creator of each of us in being the Parent of the whole human family.

But the death of Christ is indispensably necessary for our individual salvation. Repentance is a personal thing, so is faith; and the Saviour with his whole atoning work is as necessary to save one soul as the souls of a race. For, the same principle of Divine government would be violated in saving one soul without an atonement, as in saving all; and the converse is true, to save one soul involves the whole great principle of atonement.—Were any of us the only sinner of the race, to save him without a sacrifice for sin would as truly violate the rule of justice as to save a world. A case at law involving a very small sum, may call up the fundamental question of jurisprudence.

Christ himself, it may be noticed, very frequntly speaks in the singular number when he refers to the salvation of men. "Him that cometh unto me, I will in nowise cast out." "And I will raise him up at the last day." "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in unto him and sup with him, and he with me." "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." This regard for the individual is strikingly shown when the seventy returned with joy, and said that even the devils were subject unto them in the Saviour's name. The Saviour entered into their feelings: "I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven." He proceeded to give them further dominion over the power of evil. But he concluded by saying, "Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you, but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven." Neither associated privileges and honors, nor official greatness and success, he seems to say, are to be compared with the relation of the individual soul to God.

Repentance and faith are strictly personal.—Moreover, each soul needs the whole of Christ and his sacrifice as the ground of justification.—Had Christ died for one lost soul, he would not be its Saviour in any other degree than he must now be to each of us if we are saved. If justified at the bar of God, it will be because it can be demanded on behalf of each, "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died."

Indeed, Christ bestows his benefits as a personal Saviour and friend. When a man sees himself to be a sinner, and the bitter cry is wrung from him, "Have mercy upon me, O God," when he sees that he ought to be punished, and wonders at Divine forbearance, it is not enough for him that Christ died for men in general: he seeks a personal interest in Christ, and his effort is to persuade himself that this can be attained. Perhaps there is no such joy and satisfaction known to the human breast as this confidence, Christ is my Saviour, making us say with Thomas, "My Lord and my God." In the extremity of life, there is a face of a friend, a hand, which the dying man cannot spare a moment from his side. We need the most intimate personal love and kindness. Thus the dying think of Christ and of their personal re-

lation to him, however they may have slighted and forgotten him in life and health. It was so with Voltaire, and Hume, and Paine, who each made personal address to Christ in the agony of dying. The whole may be summed up in these most encouraging words of Jesus, "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." If on that day, an angel should challenge our personal right of admission to heaven, we should rest it on this, Christ died for me, in every sense in which he died for the world, and is as truly my Redeemer through faith in him as he is the Saviour of the world.

Come, then, my soul, if this be true, and if the persuasion is taking possession of you that you have in Christ a personal Saviour, who as truly died for you as though you were the only object of his death, come, and let us look upon him as he lays down his life for you. If he died for you, all which was necessary to accomplish his death was for you. He is coming out of the gate of Jerusalem, bearing a burthen on his shoulder; it has the form of a cross, it is the gibbet, it is his dying bed. He cannot lift and bear it any longer; his strength is gone; they change it to the shoulder of another man. I thank thee Simon; that is for me. The cross is extended on the earth; his form is stretched upon it, I hear the blow of the hammer as each hand and the feet are nailed to the wood; this is for me. They have lifted up the Son of man, for me. Behold, they mock him, and in many ways insult him, and he bears it patiently for me. It were enough to die for me in a peaceful chamber; the king of terrors is terrible enough in the quiet room with sympathizing friends about the bed.—What a dying bed is the cross, with fiends about it in human shape! all this was for me. The sun grows dark, the earth quakes, the rocks rend, the graves open, the dead arise, the vail of the distant temple is rent in sunder without hands, and, "it is finished,"—my redemption.

As though I had taken a lamb from my flock and offered in sacrifice for my sins, so has Jesus died for me. For this he came from heaven; for this he was God manifest in the flesh; for this he expired to save me. The last thing which men will do, or can do, for another, Jesus has done for me, and now, if not deceived I am going to heaven to claim that for no one, nor for the world, did Jesus die more truly than for me. Ye multitude which no man can number, I hear your great anthem; praise him as you will; I am coming, a chief sinner, yet obscure, and less than the least of saints, to take your mighty praise, offer it to Christ, and tell him that you have not expressed one half of my obligations to him, and that his love to me "can ne'er be told." I will take Abel's hymn of praise, the first ascription to redeeming love in heaven, and with its accumulated strength of love and joy, I will offer it merely as the pitch of my song, and tell my Saviour, as I fail and faint beneath the praise, that "his love can ne'er be told." Does a distant, new world, ages hence, desire to see a redeemed sinner, an object of the Saviour's love, one who owes as much as any other to that love? Here am I, send me.

* * * * *

The personal relation and obligation of each soul to Christ, when fully admitted, has great power to give individuality and strength of character to piety, which loses much when we lose ourselves in the great multitude. Moreover, instead of making us exclusive or solitary in our religious feelings, it is sure to expand our love for all men when one feels how Christ has loved him and died for him, and then that every other human being is as truly the object of the Saviour's sufferings and death as he. Toward every one for whom Christ has done all which he has done for him, a Christian feels, at times, great love and desire, and has no rest till every one knows and feels the love which Christ has for him.

When, therefore, the bread is given into my hand, and it is said, take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you, and, with like assurance, the cup is placed at my lips, let no thought of those around me, nor of the world at large, divide the sufferings of Christ between them and me, but let me cleave to this truth, that he is my personal Saviour. Let me hold converse with him in this persuasion; have covenant transactions with him, and regard him as though he were a private benefactor, who, having sacrificed himself for me, had been restored to life.—What inseparable union would I feel to a fellow being, in such circumstances. Then, what a foundation there is for love and attachment between me and Christ, greater already on his part than it can ever be on mine, and drawing me to constant communion and perfect consecration.

The simple object of the Supper, is Remembrance of him, promoted by symbols of his death. I go there to meet him, and to speak with him of his decease which he accomplished at Jerusalem. I shall not hear his voice, nor see his shape, nor do I expect impressions to be made on my mind of his sensible presence; yet there will not be a word in my tongue, nor a thought in my heart, "but lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether." Believing him to be at my side, I shall tell him every thing which interests me, ask counsel, lay in his hands all that concerns me for the time to come, and, without seeking a response from him, feel that he has heard, and that he fully understands, and will consider it, and in his own time and manner will do for me all that I need. I will recount to him my sins, all the circumstances of them, all their aggravations, and feel it a relief that when my heart condemns me, He is greater than my heart and knoweth all things. I will be sure to speak to him of his mercies, the peculiar features of each blessing, how considerate, how forbearing, how delicate, how generous, how touching, how perfectly suited to my wishes. Anticipating events of deep importance, I will say, If thy presence go not with me, carry me not up hence. No response, did I say, is to be looked for? As I sit and speak to him and weep at his side, there comes a gift, and this message, from him: "This is my body which is broken for you; this cup is the New Testament in my blood which is

shed for you." I ask no more. Let him say no more, for how shall he not, with this, also freely give me all things?

If you, dear reader, are one who leaves the Saviour and his table behind you, know that Christ suffered nothing for another more than he did for you. As you go home, he will walk by your side; as you sit and think of the scene which you have left behind, he will sit with you; and if you choose to be forgetful and use means to banish serious thoughts from your mind, still remember this. There is no one at that table who is more properly there than you would be, no one for whom Christ died more than for you, and there is no one who has been or can be more welcome. Wherever you go, Christ died for you. Whatever you do, Christ died for you. If you are saved, Christ died for you. If you are lost, Christ died for you. How long will you turn away, from that table which infinite love has spread for no human being more truly than for you?—*The Communion Sabbath.*

"Turned into hell."—We hear that an advocate of the *living again* of the wicked dead uses the text Psa. 9: 17 in proof; because, he says, "the word *turned* has the signification of *returned*." Indicating, we suppose, that the wicked had been in hell once and are brought out and *returned* there again. This may seem very plausible on the *surface*, but it lacks *depth*. Look at the text according to this new exposition; thus:—"The wicked shall be *returned* into hell, and all the *nations* that forget God."

Now if our friend is correct in his new construction of the term translated *turned*, then it follows that not only are the wicked dead to be revived into life but all the wicked *nations—as nations*—are to be revived, or be raised up from their disorganized condition and restored to nationality in order to be "*returned*" into hell: for one word expresses the fate of the wicked and of the nations that forget God.

Compare Psa. 9: 17 with Gen. 3: 19. God said to Adam—"Unto dust shalt thou *return*"—*shoov*, according to Pick's Concordance; the same identical word used in Psa. 9: 17. Are we to understand that Adam was to die, be raised to life from the dead, and "*returned*" unto dust again for his *one* transgression? That the term *shoov* has the sense "*to turn*" and "*return*" is admitted. Adam came from the dust—from an *invisible* state—into life: for his sin he should return, or be "returned" there again; and "the wicked," in like manner, shall be *returned* into the dust, or into *sheol*, an invisible state without recovery; and so shall "all the nations that forget God:" such nations have been and will be utterly destroyed: *returned* to the *nothingness* from whence they arose. Such, also, is the fate of the wicked.

We regard any argument built upon Psa. 9: 17, in proof of the revival into life of the wicked dead, as futile in the extreme; and the person who uses it ought not to find fault with those that say the *death* threatened Adam was three-fold, or three deaths, instead of one; for he was to be "*returned*" unto dust; and if that term necessarily implies coming up from the dead to go down again, then indeed was there more than one death embraced in the threatening to Adam and in the sentence passed on him.

The Prize Essay on "Immortality," written by Prof. Post, D. D., of St. Louis, Mo., and published in the *New Englander* of February and May, will soon be *reviewed.*

The American Pulpit: Sketches, Biographical and Descriptive, of *Living American Preachers*, and of the Religious Movements and Distinctive Ideas which they represent. *By Henry Fowler*, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Rochester. With Portraits on Steel." Published by "J. M. Fairchild & Co., No. 109 Nassau Street, *New York.*"

This is a neat and well executed octavo volume of over 500 pages, with *ten* Portraits on Steel.—This must be an interesting work to those who prefer facts to fiction, and who would like to have a knowledge of the characters of some of the most prominent Ministers of America. Price $2.

Errata.—In the first column of the last page of the Examiner for May 15, the word "if" in the 34th line from the top is a misprint—it should have been left out. Bro. Grew will please note the fact. The italicized phrase "*all* that time," in one part of "Response," should read, "*at* that time," etc.

Macknight, Jr.

The Office of the Bible Examiner is at our *Residence*, 62 *Hicks Street*, Brooklyn; a short distance from *Fulton Ferry:* but in all cases *address* us as follows:

Geo. Storrs,
Box **4658**,
New York.

Usually we can be found at home at all hours except between 9 and 11 o'clock in the morning. We have *an Agency* at 109 *Nassau Street, New York*, in the Book Store of *Fairchild & Co.*, where our works can be had *at retail*, and where orders may be left for us, as we shall call there daily between the hours indicated above. City subscribers who call for their papers will find them there hereafter.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, JUNE 15, 1856. NO. 12.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SAUL AND THE WOMAN AT ENDOR.

THE affair of Saul in consulting with the sorceress at Endor, has given rise to many singular speculations and conjectures; and in these days, when familiar spirits are so common and audacious, it is well to understand the matter if we can.

The practice of divination in its several branches, including this of necromancy among the rest, has been the occasion of great marvel in the world, especially among the pagan and idolatrous nations. Some have brought it into a kind of system, and made it a part of their religion; and scarcely any unevangelized people have been found who did not resort to it more or less, in some form or other. It is a pity that it should not be confined to the heathen, to whom it appopriately belongs and who might be expected to do such things.

But whatever else may be said on the subject, some things are very plain in regard to it. No *good* is ever ascribed to it in the sacred Scriptures, nor is it ever spoken of in terms of approbation or allowance. The inspired writers uniformly brand it with expressions of disrespect, and not unfrequently with sarcastic contempt. Nor does it appear to have been of any benefit to mankind that should entitle it to respect. There is no evidence that any community or individual, either in ancient or modern times, was ever made a whit the wiser or better for resorting to it in any shape or form. Thousands have been duped by it, and fleeced and bereft of their wits, and led into shameful follies and vices; but we are not aware that it has ever been the means of improving a person's understanding, or moral character, or happiness, or usefulness. It certainly afforded no benefit to Saul, either in mind or body. It only added to his guilt and wretchedness, and put the finishing stroke to his condemnation; for the record is, "So Saul died for his transgression which he committed against the Lord, even against the word of the Lord, which he kept not, and also for asking counsel of one which had a familiar spirit, to inquire of it, and inquired not of the Lord; therefore he slew him, and turned the kingdom unto David, the son of Jesse."

Neither do we in any instance find it spoken of as worthy of the least *confidence*. It is characterized as "vanity," "lying vanities," "vain vision," "lying divination," "flattering divination," "deceit," "falsehood;" and those who employ it as "deceivers," "lying prophets," "that see vanity, and that divine lies." With what indignant severity does Jeremiah speak of them: "They prophesy unto you a false vision and divination, and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart;" and Ezekiel, "Will ye pollute me among my people for handfuls of barley and for pieces of bread * * * * by your lying to my people that hear your lies." It is invariably treated as a work of mendacity and imposture; and nothing but the credulity of ignorance, or superstition, or both, can ever presume to give it any credit. And, moreover, a disposition to resort to it is uniformly denounced as indicating a false and wicked heart. It is recorded to the reproach of Manasseh in the days of his impiety, that he "observed times, and used enchantment, and used witchcrafts, and dealt with a familiar spirit, and with wizards; he wrought much evil in the sight of the Lord to provoke him to anger." And it is always either expressed or implied that those who practice such things are of a debased and impious character.

And still a stronger evidence of its evil tendency and effects is, that everything of the kind was absolutely *forbidden by the divine law*. "There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizzard, or a necromancer. For all that do such things are an abomination unto the Lord." "A man or a woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death; they shall stone them with stones; their blood shall be upon them." These stern denunciations of the Mosaic law were directed against every species and degree of magic arts, not because they usurped any supernatural power, but because of the mischievous tendency of all such *pretentions*, to delude and corrupt the people, withdrawing their minds from God only wise; fostering a love of the marvelous and vain; unsettling the religious convictions of such as were weak in the faith; and substituting instead an idle and dibasing superstition.

Such being the notorious character of divination in all its forms,—never spoken of with respect or tolerance in the word of God,—never as worthy of the least confidence—but always denounced and forbidden as a vile and pernicious imposition—what do we care whether we know particularly how its arts were practiced, or not? If the whole thing is a sham in fact, a lying imposi-

tion, and seriously mischievous in its effects upon the minds of the weak and credulous, what more do we wish to learn of it? What further investigation or respect does it deserve? That the divination practiced in these days under the name of *spiritualism* and the like, and the various acts of divination condemned and forbidden in the word of God, are all of the same general nature and tendency, we have no doubt. That in either case, then or now, there is anything supernatural about it, or that it has any special connection with invisible powers or spirits, good or bad, we see no reason whatever to believe. As both then and now mankind have an insatiable disposition to be prying into the unseen and the future, from a curiosity and desire to ascertain the course of fortune, or to acquire a knowledge of what is hidden and undiscoverable; so both then and now a variety of arts and expedients have been contrived to gratify and flatter this disposition; either from a love of the marvelous, the love of imposture, the love of money, the love of scepticism, or the love of being esteemed mysteriously wise and penetrating. That there are now, and always have been, some phenomena attending these arts which are not easy to be accounted for, except by the initiated, and perhaps not even by themselves in all cases, because of their ignorance of certain physical laws and agencies, is very probable; but that there is, or ever has been, any connection between the phenomena exhibited and what they are supposed to presage, except in the imagination of the diviner, or of those who are duped by him, there appears to be no reason to believe. The whole thing both as it was denounced by the Law of Moses, and as practiced in these days, is nothing, in our views, but a piece of skillful trickery, carried on in part, perhaps, by taking advantage of some occult laws and agencies of nature which are not generally understood; but still, a sheer artifice. And as under the Jewish regimen, so now, the whole thing ought to be condemned and despised; and on just the same ground, that it has a tendency to unsettle the religious faith, and to beguile and corrupt the minds of the weak and superstitious. The influence of deceivers and imposters is always hurtful. The apostle must first put Elymas to silence and confusion before he could hope to bring Sergius Paulus to embrace the faith of the gospel.

With these preparatory thoughts in mind, let us approach the sacred narrative of Saul's consulting with the sorceress at Endor; and it will appear, we think, that there was nothing supernatural in what there occurred; nothing that forms an exception to the general facts and principles already adduced. It was just what it purports to be, a specimen of "lying divination;" an example of the manner in which a shrewd woman, and base as shrewd, apt and skilled in the practice of deception, and pretending to be in communication with a familiar spirit, could contrive to impose upon the senses and the imagination of an unhappy and half-demented man. He himself was evidently made to believe that the veritable Samuel, or his ghost, was actually brought up from the dead, through the agency of this woman, to tell him what he should do, and what should befall him.—But must we believe any such thing because he did? Must we adopt his superstition as our own? Readers of the Bible have generally felt that there was something very strange and supernatural in the occurrences here related, and have resorted to various methods of accounting for them.

We will first advert to some of the opinons that have been entertained on the subject, and briefly examine their merits.

1. The most common impression of the matter seems to be, *that Samuel was really made to appear to Saul, by the special interposition and power of God*, with the design to rebuke and punish him for his impiety, by stirring up a remorseful remembrance of his rebellion, and discovering to him his last greatest calamity. But here it should be distinctly remarked, that this supposition is altogether gratuitous. The sacred narrator, from first to last, does not give the slightest intimation that God interposed in the affair otherwise than by his general permissive providence. And if we were expected to understand that the Lord did, in this instance, turn aside from his ordinary course of proceeding, and do that which is entirely unlike any thing else recorded of him in the Bible, should we not have been so clearly informed on the point as to leave no room for questioning? Is a parallel case to be found in the whole sacred record, where God wrought a miracle, and it is not ascribed to him? But more than this, are we to believe that the Lord would thus contravene his own authoritative word, which most strongly denounces, and positively forbids all dealings with familiar spirits? Would he treat that vile woman at Endor, and her still viler craft with so much consideration and respect, as to give her the power, or make her the medium, through which to send his servant Samuel from the other world, to hold an interview with the discarded Saul, when as we are expressly told, he had previously refused to answer him, "either by dreams, or by vision, or by prophets?" Would he thus set aside his own chosen and appointed methods of communicating with men, and adopt this, on which he was wont to pour his holy contempt, and which he had solemnly fobidden? Would he put so much distinction upon that sorceress, who, by his law, deserved to be stoned with stones till she died, or do so much to sanction her heathenish practices, and to encourage a belief in their reliableness, when, on all other occasions, he sought to discountenance and suppress everything of the kind by pronouncing it a lying vanity and abomination, and by affixing to it the penalty of death? Is the Lord ever, apparently even, so inconsistent, and so divided against himself? We cannot believe it; our reverence for the Most High forbids the idea. Had the Lord wished to send Samuel from the invisible world to reprove Saul and forewarn him of his doom, he could surely have done it without employing so exceptionable an agency as this.

2. Another supposition is, that Samuel was really called up and made to appear at the woman's summons, *by the power of the devil.* But here again it should be observed, that nothing of

the kind is intimated in the narrative. Satan is not introduced into the story at all, either directly or remotely, except it be in the moral character of the king and the sorceress. And besides, this supposition involves either the doctrine that Satan is possessed of independent, arbitrary power to raise the spirits of the dead at his pleasure; or that God, in this instance, delegated to him such power. But according to the Scriptures neither Satan nor any other creature, is possessed of absolute, independent power. His agency is limited by the divine permission. He cannot transcend the power on which he is dependent for existence; he cannot go beyond the restriction that God imposes upon him. As in the case of Job, Satan is represented as powerless till God gave him a limited commission; and when Satan desired to "sift" the Apostle "as wheat," we are left to infer that he would so have sifted him had not God held his malice under restraint. If, therefore, Samuel was called up by the power of the devil, it must be because God allowed and commissioned him to do it. But to suppose this involves the same objections that have already been suggested. It makes God a consenting party to a transaction, which, in all its aspects, was directly contrary to his own law, and apparently subversive of his own design in denouncing and prohibiting all magic arts. It amounts to much the same thing as saying that God performed the act himself. *Qui facit per alium, facit per se.* But is it not at variance with all our ideas of God's character, and of the conditions and privileges of departed saints, that the Lord should in this manner subject the soul of his servant Samuel to the power of the devil, to be summoned back to earth at the call of a sorceress whom the law condemned as worthy of death to appear and answer to the inquiries of such a man as Saul! The whole idea seems entirely inconsistent with Scripture, and is revolting to our moral sense. We cannot accept it. Our impression of the honor that God confers upon his departed saints quite rejects such a theory.

3. Another explanation is, *that Satan himself appeared in the disguise of Samuel*, by putting on his form, assuming his garb, and speaking in his name. This is Matthew Henry's idea. But this is attributing to the devil nothing less than miraculous power, whereas we have no evidence that he possesses any such power, unless it be given him of God, which, in a case like this, as we have intimated, would involve a Divine inconsistency. It assumes that Satan can put on the appearance, and counterfeit the living presence of any one as he pleases,—an admission that would endanger the strongest evidences of Christianity; for how could we then know that Satan did not personate the Saviour as risen from the dead, and ascending up on high? How could we be assured that he did not counterfeit Lazarus as coming forth from the grave? What confidence could we have when we meet and converse with one whom we suppose to be a good and honest man, that he is not, after all, the devil in disguise? And besides, is it congruous with the devil's character to reprove a man for his impiety and wickedness, as the apparition at Endor reproved Saul? We are indeed told metaphorically, by way of setting forth the cunning and deceitfulness of Satan, that he is "transformed into an angel of light;" but where is it affirmed that he can transform himself either into a living or dead man as he pleases? This doctrine, therefore, cannot be admitted without deranging all the laws of evidence, and leaving us in doubt whether to believe the testimony of any professed witnesses, or even of our own senses.—We cannot accept it.

4. Others have maintained that the whole account is the narrative of "a miracle, *a Divine representation or impression*, partly upon the senses of Saul, and partly upon those of the woman, and intended for the rebuke and punishment of Saul." Worse and worse! This is bringing God into direct fellowship with the heathenish and forbidden practices of divination, and claiming that he cooperated with that guilty sorceress at Endor in *deceiving* the senses of Saul, and the senses of the woman herself! It imputes to him the working of a miracle with the design to make a *representation or impression* that Samuel was present, when in reality there was no Samuel there! Are we then to believe that God is a man that he should lie, or the son of man that he should deceive, and that, too, by a special miracle? What, then, becomes of *all* miracles wrought in attestation of the truth? What further ground of confidence in them remains? We must be allowed to say, that if we were to adopt such an interpretation we should but deceive ourselves, instead of being deceived by our Maker. And yet this is the view that is gravely put forth and advocated in a work of no less pretention than Kitto's Cyclopedia, [Art. Witchcrafts.]

5. One other supposition is, that the woman, *by the mysterious power of her magic arts*, actually called up Samuel from the dead at the request of Saul. The mystery of this idea is so ridiculous that it scarcely seems worthy of serious notice. It presumes that God leaves the souls of his departed servants in subjection to the will and authority of those who practice divination in contempt of his holy word; allowing and empowering them to summon back to earth the spirits of the righteous and blessed to answer such inquiries as they may be pleased to make, and at such times and places as may suit their convenience or caprice; and all this by nothing else than the rites of sorcery!—This is marvelous truly! most exquisitely marvelous! And so we are to believe, are we, that the honored prophet Samuel was put to the degredation of being recalled from his abode of happiness and glory, and placed under the magic control of that scandalous woman at Endor? What can match this but the silly farce of modern spiritualism? We will not be so indecorous as to suppose that any of our readers have slipped back so far towards the dark ages as to entertain any such notion as this.

What, then, is the interpretation of this affair, which, almost from necessity, we are driven to adopt? It is, that the whole account is intended to be a narrative of what was *pretended* to be a reality, but which in fact was an *entire deception*. The sacred writer aims to describe the scene just

as it *appeared*, and just as the cunning woman *sought to make it appear*, to the bewildered imagination of the superstitious and unhappy Saul,—presuming his readers all along to know what estimate to put upon magic appearances; that as "an idol is nothing in the world," so all the sorceries and divination connected with idolatry are nothing but "vanity and a lie." There was no Samuel whatever in the case; no shade, no ghost or spirit of Samuel; but only was *feigned or pretended* to be Samuel,—either by the woman herself, playing part of a ventriloquist, as hinted at by the Seventy in calling her *gunee eggastrimuthos*; or by another person secreted in an adjoining room, or behind a screen, and acting in collusion with her. The whole thing, we are persuaded, was nothing more or less than a piece of artful trickery, designed and successfully managed to impose upon the mind of Saul, and make him believe a lie. The sacred historian does not take it upon him to *explain*, but only to *describe* the case, as it was made to appear. And does he, moreover, with the design to put the greater discredit and contempt upon the affair, adopt, in relating it, a smothered strain of sarcastic irony, like that of Elijah, where he rallies the prophets of Baal respecting their god, speaking of him as if he were a real god? "Cry aloud," he tells them, "*for he is a god*; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or, peradventure, he sleepeth, and must be awakened." A similar vein of satire is found in Isaiah, where he describes the process of making a graven image out of an ash tree. [Is. xliv.] And this style of language is not uncommon in the sacred writings, especially when images and lying divination are the subject of remark. So here, we venture to suggest, without affirming, that the narrator is adroitly making use of keen-edged satire, archly describing the scene and telling us what Samuel said, as if he himself believed that the prophet was really there, when in truth he believed no such thing, and did not intend or expect his readers to believe any such thing.

But if this is the construction to be put upon the narrative, that it is intended only to describe *appearances and pretensions*, and with the view to bring them into greater discredit, we may expect to find some points where the disguise *crops out*, as geologists say. Let us carefully scrutinize *Saul, the sorceress*, and *the pretended Samuel*, and see.

1. Look at the attitude in which *Saul* is exhibited in the picture. Naturally gloomy and apprehensive, superstitious and given to fits of excessive melancholy, Saul had become, through a long series of vexations and anxieties, almost or quite delirious. And now the Philistines had "gathered together all their armies" against him; David of whom he continually lived in extreme jealousy and hatred, had taken refuge in their country, and might be expected to join them with his forces in the coming contest, as Achish then King, had invited him to do; and while compelled to witness at a distance the rising power and popularity of David, he knew that he himself, on account of his ill treatment of that anointed heir of the crown, was rapidly losing the respect and confidence of his own subjects, some of them openly, and many more in heart, being decidedly alienated from him. And, worse than all, his own conscience haunted him with a sense of baseness, impiety, and crime, of which he had been guilty, and for which Samuel, while living, had sternly rebuked him. He had made light of the counsels of heaven, trampled upon divine authority, slaughtered the priests of the Lord, treated the venerable prophet with contempt, and acted very foolishly and wickedly. And now, "when he inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." Thus forsaken of God, distrusted of man, wretched in spirit, and despised in his own eyes, he beheld with terrible misgiving and agitation, the approaching storm of war. "And when Saul saw the host of Philistines, he was afraid, and in his heart greatly trembled." Under these troubles his appetite also was taken away; and when he came to the woman at Endor, "he had eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night." Was ever a man in a more fit state of mind and body to be wrought upon and deluded by the impositions of sorcery? He was already more than half bewitched in himself. Under the pressure of such feelings and circumstances he commissions his servants to seek him a woman that had a familiar spirit,—a step strongly predictive of the result, as it shows very plainly the bearing of his credulity, and his readiness to catch at any delusion that might offer. He is preparing to go as a bird to the snare; he is even helping to spread the snare for himself. Could the woman at Endor have had a more pliant subject on whom to play off her arts? If she could not befool such a man, she must have been a great fool herself. *He hoped to see Samuel, he expected to see Samuel, and he verily thought he did see Samuel.*

[To be continued.]

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

[From "Credibility of the Scriptures."]

BY J. H. M'CULLOH, M. D., BALTIMORE.

(Continued from p. 149.)

According to our theory on the subject of church officers, we have maintained that the elders or bishops, and the deacons, were persons selected either tacitly or directly from the body of believers from a mere sense of propriety and expediency. The deaconesses therefore were recognized in a similar point of view with the deacons, *i. e.* the former acted among the female portion of the congregation in like manner as the deacon did among the male members, and of this fact we shall presently furnish undoubted proof.

That there were originally but two orders of church officers, *viz:* bishops or elders, and deacons, is admitted by all Protestants but the Church of England, who contend for three, by making the bishop superior to the elder. But

without contesting this matter on the present occasion, they, as well as the Catholics admit, that the deacons were the lowest order of the divinely constituted ministry, and that they at first rendered all those subordinate services in the church that were afterwards performed by subdeacons, readers, acolyths, &c. Hence the Catholics and the Church of England say, that all the officers in the church subordinate to the deacons are mere expedient appointments made by church authorities as convenience dictated, and hence such persons receive no ecclesiastical ordination in the proper sense. The bishops, presbyters, and deacons, as being from divine institution, are solemnly ordained in churches by an imposition of the hands of bishops or presbyters.

But it is undeniable that during the first two or three centuries, the deaconesses were ordained publicly in churches by an imposition of the bishop's hands as formally as was done to either presbyters or deacons; and further, the deaconesses were recognized expressly by the nineteenth canon of the Council of Nice, to be a part of the clergy.

That the deaconesses were ordained by imposition of hands, is abundantly shewn by Bingham, as above quoted, who also states from various authorities, that their ordination was accompanied by the express ecclesiastical technicalities of *cheirotonia cheirothesia*, both signifying imposition of hands.

The Apostolic Constitutions not only recognize the deaconesses to be clergy, but their institution is mentioned with even a blasphemous comparison as may be seen from the following extract, (*Apostol. Oonstitu. lib.* ii. 26,) which is headed,

"According to what pattern and dignity *every order of the clergy* is appointed by God.

"Let *the bishop* therefore preside over you as one honored with the authority of God, &c., But let *the deacon* minister to him (the bishop) as Christ does to his Father, &c. Let also *the deaconess be honored of you in the place of the Holy Ghost*, and do not, nor say any thing without the deacon, &c., And as we cannot believe on Christ without the teaching of the Spirit, so let not any woman address herself to the deacon, or to the bishop *without the deaconess*. Let the presbyters be esteemed by you to represent us the apostles, and let them be the teachers of divine knowledge," &c.

In further proof of the clerical character of the deaconesses previous to the fourth century, I shall extract from the Apostolical Constitutions the directions there ascribed to the apostles concerning the ordination of presbyters, deacons, and deaconesses, which the reader will perceive are precisely alike as to any external form or ceremony. (See *Apostol. Constitu. lib.* viii. *chaps.* 16–18.)

Ordination of a Presbyter.—"When thou ordainest a presbyter, O bishop, *lay thy hands upon his head in the presence of the presbyters and deacons*, and pray saying," &c. Then follows the prayer that he may be replenished with the spirit of grace and counsel qualifying him to discharge his office.

Ordination of a Deacon.—"Thou shalt ordain a deacon, O bishop, *by laying thy hands upon him in the presence of the whole presbytery and of the deacons*, and shall pray saying," &c. Then follows, the prayer that he may be replenished with the Holy Spirit, &c. "And grant that he may discharge acceptably the ministration of a deacon, steadily, unblamably, without reproof, and be accounted worthy of a higher degree, through the meditaion of thine only begotten Son, with whom," &c.

Ordination of a Deaconess.—"Concerning a deaconess, O bishop, thou shalt *lay thy hands upon her in the presence of the presbytery and of the deacons and deaconesses*, and shalt say, O eternal God the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the creator of man and woman, who didst with thy spirit replenish Miriam, and Deborah, and Anna, and Huldah, who didst not disdain that thy only begotton Son should be born of a woman, who also in the tabernacle of the testimony and in the temple did ordain women to be keepers of thy holy gates, do thou thyself also now look upon this thy handmaid appointed to the office of a deaconess, and grant her the Holy Spirit, and cleanse her from all filthiness of flesh and spirit that she may worthily discharge the work that is committed unto her, unto thy glory and the praise of thy Christ, with whom glory," &c.

The facts of the case therefore are distinct, that for nearly three centuries the deaconesses did receive ordination in no wise different from that of the presbyters and deacons, and consequently if these last were made members of a divinely appointed clergy by such ordination, then the deaconesses must in like manner be considered members of this divine corporation of clergy.

But the doctrine having gradually prevailed among the church officers before the middle of the third century, that they were the successors of the Aaronical priesthood, whose high-priest, priest and levite were represented by bishop, presbyter and deacon; it then became necessary to get rid of the deaconesses, to whose function there was nothing analogous under the Jewish priestly system. This end was obtained by gradually reducing the deaconess to the same class as the subdeacon, acolyth, reader &c. and having once taken such a position it was then followed up by decrees of councils positively *forbidding the deaconesses to be ordained in the church by an imposition of hands*. This was done by the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 370, by the eleventh canon. First Council of Orange, A. D. 441, by the twenty-sixth canon. Second Council of Orleans, A. D. 533, by the eighteenth canon, &c. (See *Du Pin, and Bingham Antiq. Christ Church, lib.* ii. *chap.* 22.) Ultimately the order was entirely abolished.

If we go backward however in time before the deacons were exalted to the priestly order, we have the clearest evidences they discharged no other function among the Christian brethren, than the deaconess did to the female sex. Thus in the *Apostol. Const. lib.* ii. *chap.* 58, it is provided that when persons come into the churches, whether "a poor man, or one of the low family, or a stranger,

whether he be young or old, the *deacon* shall find a place (a seat) for these with his heart, instead of accepting persons before men, &c. The very same thing let *the deaconess* do for those women that come, whether they be poor or rich."

In book iii. chap. 15, it is said, "For which reason, O bishop, do thou ordain thy fellow workers, the laborers, for life and righteousness, such *deacons* as are pleasing to God, such as thou provest to be worthy among all the people and such as shall be ready for the necessities of their ministration. Ordain also *a deaconess* who is faithful and holy *for ministration to the women. For sometimes thou canst not send a deacon, who is a man, to the women in certain houses on account of the unbelievers. Thou shalt therefore send a woman, a deaconess,* on account of the imagination of the bad."

"*And we stand in need of a woman, a deaconess for many occasions,* and first in the baptism of women; *the deacon* shall anoint their forehead with the holy oil, and after him the *deaconess* shall anoint them, for there is no necessity that the women should be seen (*i. e.* naked) by the men," &c.

In the next, or sixteenth chapter, the formularies for baptism are prescribed, and the bishop is directed to dip them in the water, "and let *a deacon* receive the man, and *a deaconess* the woman," &c.

In the eighth book chapter twenty-eight, which is esteemed by critics to be of later compilation than the preceding seven books, it is said, "*A deacon doth not bless, doth not give the blessing,* but receiveth from the bishop and presbyter. *He doth not baptize, he doth not offer,*" (*i. e.* consecrate the eucharist) "but when a bishop or presbyter hath offered," (*i. e.* consecrated, &c.) "he" (the deacon) "distributeth to the people, not as a priest, *but as one that ministers to the priests.*"

"*A deaconess* doth not bless, nor perform any thing belonging to the office of presbyter or deacon, but is only to keep the doors," (*i. e.* on that side of the church where the women entered, as the deacon did on the other side,) "and to minister to the presbyters in the baptizing of women on account of decency."* &c.

From the preceding quotations it must be evident that the deacons and deaconesses originally exercised precisely analogous functions, unless in the immaterial exception that the deacon, probably, exclusively handed the bread and wine of the sacrament among the communicants at the love feasts. In other respects their duties were the same. Indeed it could not be otherwise, for as we have shown above, the deacon was expressly forbidden *to either bless, baptize, or consecrate the sacrament.* This absolute negation of sacerdotal functions to the deacon is also insisted upon in book viii. chap. 46, where it is said, "*It is not lawful for a deacon to offer the sacrifice,*" (*i. e.* consecrate the eucharist) "*or to baptize, or to give the blessing small or great.*" And to meet the objection that Philip the deacon, and Ananias, had baptized the eunuch and St. Paul, the compiler of the *Apostol. Const.* asserts, that those acts had been performed only from an express commission of Christ.

Nothing therefore can be clearer than that the deacon being forbidden to exercise any priestly functions, he was necessarily a mere servant or assistant to the bishop or presbyter, and consequently could do no more among men than the deaconess could do among women. We might go on and shew how they were both actually employed, but our object is merely to prove in their original appointment their ordination and functions were precisely similar, and when detached from the devices of ecclesiastical corruptions, both deacon and deaconess will be found to have been mere expedient institutions that were of greater or less utility, but that neither has any divine commission for the exercise of their functions; and this fact being established, it sufficiently proves that neither were the bishops or presbyters of any divine institution, since they cannot refer to any higher authority for their ordination than the deacon or deaconess.

After this somewhat digressive discourse concerning deaconesses, which is however of the utmost importance as illustrating the actual position of church officers in the earlier ages of Christianity; we again resume our argument against the theory of any divinely constituted clergy, as founded upon what the apostles have either said, or omitted to say, concerning officers in Christian congregations.

In 1 *Tim. chap.* v. 17, Paul writes, "let the *elders* (presbuteroi) that rule well be accounted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." Whether this means a greater amount of respectful consideration, or whether it alludes to some compensation for the time and services rendered by such elders, it is not important that we should determine,* the facts of themselves sufficiently shew a certain religious organization. But that it differed from that of a

* The reader can fully understand the force of this remark if he remembers what we stated Vol. II. 142, that at these times both men and women when they were baptized were stripped stark naked.

* My opinion however is, that the apostle's observation applies to these dovout persons who preached the gospel in adjacent villages, or as we should call them missionaries, and consequently as long as thus employed could not also labor for their subsistence. Such persons therefore were to be lodged in the houses of the brotherhood whereever they came, and to be gratuitously furnished with food and whatever necessaries they might require. This however, was only to be done while they continued to act as missionaries, for if they married and had families they must work to support them, as it is now said of the Methodist preachers when they withdraw from the itineracy, "*they locate*" *i. e.* the church no longer provides for them and they must occupy themselves in some secular calling.

The whole matter I think may be fairly estimated by what Christ said to the apostles when he sent them to preach the gospel, (*Math.* x. 9–11) as also the seventy disciples, (*Luke*, x. 7, 8.)

class or of a prayer meeting we are not justified to believe, for as the present occasion afforded the apostle the fairest opportunity to have urged upon Timothy, the necessity of making suitable provision for the *elders* as members of a divine ecclesiastical institution, so as he has not even alluded to such a system it is impossible we can suppose that Paul recognized any such organization. Furthermore in *chap.* iv. the apostle warns Timothy of a future great apostacy from Christianity, and desires him to "put the brethren in remembrance of these things as a good *minister* (*diakonos*) of Jesus Christ." Here again was a most suitable opportunity to have taught the people to look to their divinely constituted ministry, lest they should be seduced from the true faith; nevertheless he does not say a word on the subject, which silence I presume fully justifies the belief that no clerical body existed at that time in the ordinary sense of the term.

I shall for the present pass over the consideration of the argument that the advocates of diocesan episcopacy have endeavored to deduce from this epistle in favor of their doctrine, for as their reasoning alike includes the 2d Epistle to Timothy, and that to Titus, we apprehend our simplest course will be to estimate the subject after having shown the scope and bearing of the three epistles.

The Epistle to Titus was written in the same year as the one first addressed to Timothy, which is supposed to have been about A. D. 64, and is the same in substance. Paul left Titus in the Island of Crete "that thou should set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* (presbuteroi) in every city as I had appointed thee."—He then gives him various directions as to the moral qualifications of such persons in which the terms *elders* (presbuteroi) and *bishops* (episcopoi) are evidently synonymous.

That the apostle considered the selection of *zokonem*, elders, or bishops to be a matter of great importance at that time is very evident from his observation to Titus, (*chap.* i. 10, 11,) "for there are many *unruly* and vain talkers and deceivers, especially they of the circumcision, (*i. e.* judaizing Christians,) *whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake.*" Now if Paul had recognized a divinely constituted ministry of ecclesiastics at this time, here was a most suitable opportunity for him to have insisted upon the divine commission of the persons to be ordained by Titus as elders or bishops, not only that they might claim authority for their general preaching, but especially so that they might put a stop to those *unruly and vain teachers*, who were propagating false doctrines in the midst of a Christian population. But as the apostle does not say a word that implies any such divine clerical system, when so evident a propriety existed for its enunciation, I apprehend nothing can be more fairly inferred than that it could not have had any existence. And again on the other hand, as the apostle's instructions apply perfectly well as directing suitable persons to be selected as the leaders of a class or prayer-meeting, so neither do any of the above objections apply to them which are so evidently hostile to the clerical hypothesis.

After having introduced the subject of the appointment of *elders*, and specified what ought to be their moral and intellectual qualifications, Paul in his Epistle to Titus, as it is not unusual with him, digresses by making some severe reflections upon the character of the Cretans and admonishes Titus how to deal with them. In the second chapter, he again resumes the subject of the ordination of church officers, and directs that the *elders*, (*presbutas*) improperly rendered *aged men* in our English Bibles, should be "sober, grave temperate, sound in faith, in charity, in patience."—The *aged women*, "(*presbutidas*) *i. e.* the deaconesses or *widows*, (see our observations, page 209,) should likewise in behaviour, be as becometh holiness, not false accusers, not given to much wine, *teachers of good things. That they may teach,*" (*sōphronizōsi*) *i. e.* properly instruct in sobriety, discretion, &c.) "the young women to love their husbands," &c.

That these *elderly persons*, of whom Paul speaks, whether male or female were not mere aged individuals of the congregation, but those official persons whom we have technically denominated as elders, deaconesses, &c. is sufficiently clear in the circumstance that the exhortation to them involves the very qualifications required by 1 *Tim.* iii. 2–8 in the selection of elders, deacons and deaconesses, as we have shown on page 208. Furthermore the object of the exhortation to the *elderly women*, in *Titus* ii. 3 and 4, is expressly stated to be, to the end of their being *teachers or instructors of the younger women*, as to the decorum and proprieties of a Christian life. It is plain therefore that the *elderly women* as mentioned in the epistle of Titus, were the same class of persons who in other places are spoken of as deaconesses, widows, &c. and whom we have already shewn exercised a function among the women similar to that rendered by the deacons towards the male members of the congregation.

As might be expected, neither the advocates of Episcopacy or of the Presbyterian form of church government are generally willing to admit that these *aged women* (presbutidas) mentioned in Titus, held an ecclesiastical position in the churches. The construction of the Greek phraseology and the plain inferences from it however are so strong, that many individual divines and theologians acknowledge they have doubts as to the correctness of the ordinary interpretations put upon the words in question. Others however have distinctly recognized that these *aged women* did hold an official position in the primitive Christian congregations, and when we consider how strongly the prejudices of the clergy are opposed to such a recognition, we perceive there must be great force in the evidence in favor of our construction when clergymen are impartial enough to admit such an exposition.*

* Macknight on the epistles is very distinct as to this point. Bloomfield, (*Recen. Synop.*) after noticing Macknight's opinion, says, that Ham-

It was probably to these female officers, or deaconesses, that Paul alludes to in various places in his epistles, where he censures them for having attempted publicly to exhort or preach in the congregation. But that they were authorized to instruct other persons, and especially their own sex in private houses or, in the familiarity of the domestic circle, is evident from the honorable mention of such women in various places of the New Testament. Thus Apollos (*Acts.* xvi. 26) was instructed by Aquilla and his wife Priscilla. Paul also enumerates certain women, (*Romans* xvi, 12) who had labored in extending the knowledge of Christian truth. The four daughters of Philip the evangelist, mentioned *Acts.* xxi. 9, "which did prophesy," were probably of this class of women, *i. e.* they exhorted or instructed their own sex, or indeed any other persons with whom they came into contact in their family intercourse.

---

mond, and Le Clerc, had the same views. Bloomfield himself, though he thinks the apostle spoke of women generally, yet adds that "he also had in mind those who filled ecclesiastical offices,"—in other words the deaconesses.

Pyle, in his paraphrase of the words in question, says, "elderly women particularly such as are employed by the church," to this he adds a note stating they were *deaconesses:* as he had observed in like manner in a note on 1 *Tim.* iii. 11.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, June 15, 1856.

THE RESURRECTION.

1 CORINTHIANS 15TH CONSIDERED.

In our previous article of May 15th we brought our remarks down to verse 23. We trust it was made evident that the apostle was not speaking of a "*general* resurrection" at all, whatever may be the fact in relation to such a resurrection. The revival into *life*, first of Christ, "AFTERWARDS *they* that are Christ's at his coming," constitutes the whole theme of the apostle, so far as the resurrection is concerned in this chapter. The remaining part of it, now to be considered, goes to confirm this view, if it needs confirmation.

That the resurrection spoken of was that of believers, and of them only, seems evident from the apostle's questions verse 29—"What shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they baptized for the dead?"

Whatever else these words may embrace, they unquestionably relate to the confidence the believer had in Christ's words of promise—"I will raise *him* up at the last day." In that faith they were baptized. Hence the resurrection spoken of is a promised and covenant blessing: a *peculiarity* of those *in* Christ, and by virtue of a union with him; of which union baptism was the outward sign and the expression of the faith of the baptized that they should be made *alive* from the dead "at Christ's coming from heaven:" verse 23, and Phil. 3: 20, 21.

The apostle next shows the folly of believers' exposing themselves to sufferings and death if they are to have no resurrection. "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus what advantageth it me if the dead rise not?"—Can any thing be more evident than the fact, that Paul speaks in this language of the *immortal* life as contrasted with the present fleeting one? It is not a general revival into life he is here speaking of, but a *peculiar* one: a resurrection—a revival into life which is a gospel benefit to those who suffered and died, or exposed themselves to death, for Christ and his cause. If there is no such peculiar blessing promised in the gospel, then let us make the most of this life.

He goes on to speak of this re-living of the dead, and says—"So also is the resurrection of THE DEAD: they are sown in corruption: they are raised in incorruption;" verse 42. We have used the Syriac, "they are," instead of "it is," in our translation. The sense is the same, but the Syriac is more expressive. Observe, it is "the dead" that are raised; and Paul declares they are "raised in incorruption;" hence will die no more; and hence also, none but those "*in* Christ" are embraced. Paul adds—"They are sown in dishonor, they are raised *in* GLORY." Surely this belongs alone to those in Christ; but it is "the dead"—without limitation—*i. e.*, all who are to have a revival into life. Here then the peculiarity of the revival from the dead is manifestly a gospel benefit, pertaining to the followers of him who was "the first fruits of them that slept" in him. "It is sown in weakness; it is raised in POWER," adds the apostle.

Paul then proceeds to contrast the two Adams; and he shows that our animal, mortal, dying constitution is derived from the first Adam, and that no spiritual nature is thus derived. Hence the revival principle is not in ourselves, but it comes by the second Adam, who is the spiritual, and head of the new creation; as the mortal Adam was head of the animal creation. Such as have no spiritual union with the second Adam follow the condition and share the fate of the first Adam—"as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy." But those in Christ, being made "partakers of the divine nature"—as saith Peter—or spiritual, like Christ, the second Adam, or

"heavenly," as Paul expresses it verse 48—are to be made alive from the dead; or made to "bear the image of the heavenly;" for, saith Paul, "flesh and blood"—such a nature as is inherited from Adam the first "cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" he adds "neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."

Thus the apostle excludes those who are animal and corruptible—not partakers of the spiritual Adam—from all part in the resurrection of which he speaks; for, saith he, "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and THE DEAD shall be raised incorruptible, and *we*"—who are *in* Christ, and are alive—"shall be changed; for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." Thus the raised ones—"the dead" made alive—are incorruptible and immortal; none others come within the Apostle's view in the re-living of the dead ones.

The apostle puts on the cap stone, which forms the climax; and in our mind, settles the question that there is no other re-living of the dead ones after "they that are Christ's at his coming" have been "made alive." He saith—"so when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, *Death* is swallowed up in *victory*." Thus he fixes the time of death's complete overthrow at the last trump, when those in Christ put on immortality; which leaves no ground for the supposition that there is to be another resurrection after that. All that are made alive, are made so immortal and incorruptible, which finishes the triumph over death: the victory is complete. The triumphant song follows—"Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Thus the wicked dead are eternally shut out from view, and from life: they appear no more for ever. With "the *sting* of death," which "is sin," unextracted, they fell under death's power; and by "the strength of sin," which "is the law," they are held for ever in bondage to death: "the wages of sin is death:" its victory over those who "die in their sins" is never annulled: they sink to gehenna and live no more.

"Therefore my beloved brethren, be *ye* steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as *ye* know that *your* labor is not in vain in the Lord."

Thus does the apostle conclude his discourse on the resurrection of the dead: and it all proclaims, as with a trumpet tongue—LIFE FROM THE DEAD IS ONLY TO THOSE IN CHRIST; AND IS TO INCORRUPTION AND IMMORTALITY.

SAUL AND THE WITCH AT ENDOR.—The article commencing on the first page, we copy from the *New Englander*, the same Quarterly that contains Dr. POST'S *Essay* on Immortality. It does not harmonize very well with the Essay; and is quite as hostile to the common notion of dead men being alive—which has so often been attempted to be proved by this case—as any thing we have ever written or published. We intend to give the remainder of the article in our next. Considering the source from whence it comes, it is clear evidence that, to avoid the inroads of Spirit Rapping on Orthodoxy, our good orthodox friends are disposed to borrow our weapons. They are welcome to use them, and we hope they will not despise such weapons because we have used them to kill the *mother* while they find them so necessary in killing the *children*; for spirit rapping is a legitimate child of the doctrine of "dead men alive," which nearly all the theologians still maintain.—They may find that the only way in which spirit-rapping and papal foolery can be effectually met is by the use of the grand gospel truth, no future life out of Christ, and that life not till the resurrection from the dead. This doctrine established and maintained would sweep Christendom of Papal purgatory, and all the saint worship which robs God and his Christ; and spirit-rapping would go to the same funeral pile, and both together be consumed.

A Correspondence.

The following letters, though a private correspondence, are of interest to our subscribers, and we have judged best to place them before our readers, withholding the name of the author of the first, not having consulted him in the matter of making it public. The writer however is a man of years and well known.

"*Dear Bro. Storrs.*—I am glad you design to review Prof. POST'S articles. I have read them and see that his first article needs but a brief reply—that it contradicts Dr. BEECHER'S reasoning—that his two pieces afford a grand chance to show the false views and partial examination of the Bible used by our opponents. Calling Matt. 25 and Rev. 14, &c., "Didactic teaching" shows his folly and contradicts BARNES and all critics, and even common sense. He murders the meaning of *aion*, &c.—uses the same untruth Stuart does

—"that no other terms tell the endless duration of saints and God." He insults the Saviour in explaining Mark 9th, by saying, "it is not necessary to inquire whether Christ meant by this *imagery* what Isaiah meant or not, or what was the use and import of the imagery." I hope you will give a lengthy review, and get it into a pamphlet—it would get our views before the Presbyterians.—They will want to see how you use their *champion.*

"I see he takes up your argument of the non-resurrection of the wicked; but if he gains any help by it, it will be noticed but little, as it is but a small item of our argument. The way he may gain by it is, he has strong texts to prove it wrong, and the mass do not, and will not go into the long and critical examination which it requires. This is the reason I yet think that the discussion, especially prominently, had better be left, till our great point—*final destruction*—is better and more generally known. I yet fear it will shut ears against our great reform. The reason the Spirit made not the point plainer, I think, is, that it is a *momentary* act; while the *eternal* state, being infinite, is made plain; and made so without this argument. From what I learn three-fourths of the brethren will not adopt your views, and so it cannot be used to good effect, and increases divisions. I have but little anxiety about the point, only as I fear it will check our great objectt—hat God is *good*, and *evil* is to end. We *shall* awake the world to look more at *unending* things.—Should the time come when our main efforts would be against restorationism, I query whether this should be made prominent, as it could remove but two of their many strong texts.

"Believing that by making this point too prominent fewer will take your useful paper, I make these few remarks as suggestions, hoping you will take them kindly as from a friend and well wisher to yourself and the glorious reform to which, with myself, you have dedicated your life. The Lord give us wisdom to "save some," and honor his Name—Amen."

Response to the Foregoing.

Dear Bro.—I thank you for your very kind letter, and appreciate your feelings and advice on the *non-living* again of the wicked dead. The EXAMINER has had more in it on that question than I expected or desired. But what can I do, while Brethren, who had the *affirmative*, and of course the *opening* argument, still persist in writing as if they were entitled to have the *closing* one also? They have protracted the discussion by the repetition of the same arguments again and again. *Personally*, I care not how long they extend their plea for *sin and sorrow;* or how valient they are for what they regard as truth.—I knew *this battle* must be fought sooner or later; and I for one, fear not to meet it at any time. I desired long that "this cup" might "pass from me;" dreading the additional reproach it must bring; and the Lord is my witness, that so long as I could avoid it, with a good conscience, so long did I keep silence: yet, still, I have no wish to press it; though I do not think, among our opponents, it will injure us essentially. I am of opinion that the most intelligent and thoughtful ones will think us more consistent than before. But whatever they may think or do is not the question with me. It is—*What is truth?* and, *What do the Scriptures teach?* This point settled, and I have no other concern. God will take care of the consequences; yet I am far from thinking we should not use prudence and discretion in promulgating the *truth* even. "I have many things to say unto you, but ye *cannot bear them* NOW," is as true to-day as when our blessed Lord Jesus Christ uttered it.

I started in the doctrine you and so many others now love, and are comforted by, with less countenance, and with more popularity to lose, and with the prospect of greater suffering and reproach, than I now have by the doctrine of *life only* IN *Christ* for the dead. By this new development, of what I regard as truth, the character of God is fully vindicated, and seen in all its beauty and glory as the God of justice, truth and love; while Universalism and the *Torment* doctrine are both eternally overthrown.

However you may feel about it *now*, I have no doubt the time will come when you will as fully "bless God" that He has enabled such a worm as I to make bare my breast to the storm of opposition on this point, as on the destruction of the wicked. I praise the name of the Lord from my inmost heart that He has delivered me from this last remnant of barbarism attributed to His Government. Still Bro.—I feel no unkind feelings towards those who cannot see as I do, on this question now; only let them not revile me for my honest convictions and a candid expression of them. Some I am sorry to say, show a *bitter* spirit and labor to injure me in the dark: persons, too, much younger than myself, and who have seldom shown themselves in the forefront of the hottest battle, though they seem to wish to have it thought they have labored more than we all.

As to Prof. Post's work, I do not think there is any thing in it which he *designed* to relate to the "argument of the non-resurrection of the wicked;" it is a mere incidental remark; not that he supposed any of us deny such a resurrection; because he says elsewhere, that the advocates of annihilation believe the sins of this life will *require ages* beyond the grave for retribution. I do not think, therefore, that he makes any intentional allusion to the subject: and I doubt if he knew that any of us questioned the re-living of the wicked dead.

Yours, truly, in hope of Life Eternal, through Jesus Christ our Lord alone.

GEO. STORRS.

New York, June 3d, 1856.

ANNIHILATION ANNIHILATED.—How do you think it was done? Read the following and you will see. We copy it from a Correspondent of the *Ambassador* of this city.

Rev. Mr. P. of the Oberlin School, on the 23d inst., delivered a sermon on the Annihilation of the wicked. After laboring long and hard to vindicate the Justice of God in inflicting human beings with endless pains, he gave utterance to the following awful sentence.

"Why! you never heard that the doctrine of Annihilation ever made a maniac in the world, while Endless Misery (hesitating) has made scores of them. This is one of the best evidences of its truth. The damned in hell would offer up a prayer that they might be annihilated; but for God to comply with their desire, would be showing them mercy; therefore, he would not, or could not grant it!!"

Does God's truth demand the testimony of "scores of maniacs?" If such is the fruit of his creed, is it not evidence that it is a God-dishonoring and man-destroying system of false religion? While listening to the above, my blood curdled in my veins. I found myself involuntarily rising to ask, in behalf of Mr. P., the God of heaven and earth, to forgive the vile slander. But remembering my position, smothered my feelings and kept my peace. Even now I feel unable to make a proper comment on the sentence—"Endless Misery has made scores of maniacs, and that is strong evidence of its truth!"

The two sermons* have in part, done their legitimate work. They have caused a deep shock to vibrate along the heart strings of the more enlightened and sympathizing of the Church. One of its worthy attendants a few evenings after, remarked before quite a number, that if he had a family of children he would not have them listen to such preaching, for any consideration whatever. No; and he is not alone. He is but one of the large number who give their support to that church.

*Mr. P. had preached a sermon previously, in which he gave "an elaborate explanation of the awful pains people were suffering in the flames of hell."—ED. EX.

A New Work by Eld. Blain.

Bro. Storrs.—I have just got out another pamphlet of 48 pp. entitled "*A Review*, giving the main ideas in Dr. E. BEECHER'S *Conflict of Ages*, and a reply to them, and to his many Reviewers. To which is added *the Bible meaning of the word Hell*—also, two hundred texts quoted to show the nature of future punishment."

It is covered the same as "GLAD TIDINGS;" and worth $5, per 100, and 10 cents single—20 for $1, and postage prepaid where money is sent.

My object in this work is the same as I assigned for publishing *Glad Tidings*, namely, 1st to condense my larger work:—2d, many will buy a cheap work, or read it if given, who would not buy nor read a large one. And further—4000 of "*Death not Life*," were sold before my review of Dr. Beecher was added; and I hope brethren will want to see the views of this deep, and independent thinker, who has done so much, indirectly, to root up endless misery, as can be seen by my review in this pamphlet. What renders it more important to learn Dr. Beecher's views is the fact that he is about to publish a sequel to his great work, to meet and answer his reviewers; and thus keep up what we need, a debate on the penalty of God's law, and wake up a sleepy church to examine *our* views.

Want of means to pay for publishing my works has kept me from traveling as I wish to, and will detain me at home till the last of June.

Buffalo, N. Y., June 2, 1856.

J. BLAIN.

From Jacob Grim.

PLYMOUTH TOWNSHIP, PA., May 31st.

Br. Storrs.—I am still lecturing to the people of this place. The Rev. Mr. Smith, from Norristown, favored us with a sermon on future punishment, Sunday evening week. I inquired of him, in a polite manner, if I might be permitted to ask him a question; he said, "Yes." I asked him, how he would attempt to prove that the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked would destroy God himself? which he asserted. He replied, that man was made in the image of God.

When I wished to ask, if it followed that to destroy an image of anything, the thing itself must be destroyed, he politely told me he would not argue the question; and further that he did not wish to be disturbed in his course.

After he was through, I announced a meeting for last Sunday evening; in which (announcement) I told the gentleman if he would come, I would show him that he neither understood what he was talking about, nor did he apply the passages he quoted to the right subjects—and that he was entirely ignorant of the things he was discoursing of. And further, if he would favor me with his pre-

sence, I would give him opportunity to interrupt me with any question he might ask upon the subject. I spoke the following Sunday evening, but the gentleman was not present. I informed any of his friends they might call me to order, if I misrepresented any thing he said; but there was none to say a word. I have expected before this to get a drubbing, but this has been the first feeble attempt to sustain the *old* theory.

My Post-office address is NORRISTOWN, Pa.

What did the Ancients Believe?

Bro. Storrs:—I have been for a long time collecting and arranging historical facts relating to the rise and progress of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; from which I extract the following for the benefit of your readers.

The Pharisees believed the doctrine [the transmigration and separate existence of souls] in the days of Christ. But how long they held it, and where, or from whom, they first received it, we have as yet been unable to ascertain. One thing however is certain, they could not have believed it over one hundred years before Christ; for, they, as a sect, did not exist previous to that time.

They could not have received it from the Jewish Scriptures, for its writers bear positive testimony against the idea, as we have already seen. Yea, more. We find that some among those who suffered martyrdom for obeying strictly the Jewish laws had no faith in this dogma of the immortality of the soul.

A remarkable fact is upon record bearing testimony to this assertion.

Seven brethren with their mother, were seized by the wicked Antiochus Epiphanes and scourged in a most inhuman manner, and finally put to death, because they would not eat swine's flesh contrary to their law.

After the first was dead, the second was taken; and after submitting to the most cruel torture, as he was about to expire he spoke thus to the king—"Wicked prince! you bereave us of this present life; but the king of heaven and earth, if we die for the defence of his laws, will one day raise us up to everlasting life."

As the thrid was about to die he stretched forth his hands and bravely said:

"I received these limbs from heaven, but now I despise them, since I am to defend the laws of God; from the sure and steadfast hope that he will one day restore them to me."

The fourth was tortured in the same manner, and being ready to die said to the king:—

"It is for our advantage to be killed by men, because we hope that God, by raising us up again, will restore us to life; but thy resurrection, O King, will not be unto life."

In the mean time their mother, supported by the hope she had in God, beheld with incredible resolution all her seven sons die thus in one day. She encouraged them by her discourse, full of fortiude and wisdom, and uniting a womanly courage with the tenderness of a mother she said to them:—

"I am sure that the Creator of the world, who fashioned man, and who gave being to all things, will one day restore you to life by his infinite mercy, in return for your having despised it here, out of the love you bear to his laws."—*See Rollin's Ancient History*, vol. 2. p. 198.

In the dying words of these brethren we find no trace of a supposed entity, which survives the death of the body; but like all believers in the truth as it is, we find three with their mother speaking about dying and being raised again to future everlasting life; thus showing by the strongest, and most explicit language, that they expected to go into the grave, and there remain until the resurrection day.

But I am inclined to think, that had the doctrine of man's going to heaven or hell at death, been as prevalent in their time as in ours, we should have found still stronger expressions than these; as it was, they needed only to express their faith; for but few, if any, of the church of God held a different faith in their day.

Griffin's Corner, N. Y. J. P. COWLES.

From Eld. J. Blain, Buffalo. N. Y.

Br. Storrs.—As brethren love to read letters, especially those which are calculated to cheer them in the midst of persecution, I send another from our good Presbyterian Brother of Washington Co., N. Y., whose letter in the EXAMINER, in January last, encouraged us in two particulars:—one, that the ears of *all* ministers are not yet closed against reform; the other, that our books *will* make an impression wherever they go.

The other is from the interior of Pennsylvania, and is encouraging in showing that our views are slowly making their way into all parts of our land. Let brethren continue to buy and send books to friends, as some one has to this far-off brother, and we shall not long be reproached as a sect which are to work only "in a corner."

J. BLAIN.

Sandy Hill, April 3rd, 1856.

Dear Sir.—I regret that I have not been able to answer your letter before. I had intended to do so, but have been so engaged in other matters that it has been delayed too long. I received some time since a package of books from you which I have distributed, as I suppose that was your intention.

You inquire how we are going on in these parts on the subject of future punishment. It has created quite a ferment in all our churches, and all the ministers have been preaching against the "new doctrine" with great zeal and better discussion; for the very means they have used to put it down has excited curiosity in the minds of many to see and inquire what it is all about; and many are now willing to read the books who would not touch them before. Mr. L. has preached six or seven sermons on the subject, in a very abusive

and vindictive style, which, I think, will injure him much more than it will do him good. I have requested the use of the Presbyterian church to preach one sermon on the subject in self-defence; this was granted, and I endeavored to set forth what I considered to be the *Truth* in a mild and Christian spirit, not returning railing for railing; and I think this has had a good effect, as far at least as to put a stop to the violent style of the denunciation that was before used. What has been said since has been much *milder*, and an effort has been made to deny any personal application, and to cast all the censure on the *books* that were circulated. But the people will judge for themselves about that; those who have heard the sermons know better, and it will be hard to convince them that all this denouncing was intended to be wasted on the "books" and their authors.

I think, with a little discussion and care the subject in hand will, in time, have influence over some minds that are now open to conviction; but I know from my own experience, that it requires time and patience to overcome habit, prejudice, and popular doctrines. I have to defend myself as well as I can on all sides, and find that by asking a few questions in return, I can soon put those unacquainted with the subject either to silence or to examination.

I am persuaded that the views we have taken are the only ones to put a stop to the progress of the spiritual mania now in progress amongst us. There are many in this place deeply engaged in this "demon worship;" and members of all our churches; yet the ministers seldom or ever mention the subject, though they know that it tends directly to infidelity, and rejection of the Bible as a rule of faith or practice.

It is said that there are 500 people, at Glens Falls, believers in this delusion; and all the time on the increase; their papers and books are circulated all about; and where received are calculated to destroy all faith in the word of God, and all Christian doctrines. Yet it is openly declared, by Christian ministers and others, that this system of error is not half so bad as to deny the immortality of the soul and the endless torment of the wicked.

I have had many arguments on this subject, and am at a loss to know how a system that takes the Bible as its only rule and guide in faith and practice, even if an error, can be so much worse than one that subverts and destroys all the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and is rapidly tending to destroy all the churches in our land. I can get no answer only, "it is so," and that is argument enough for most minds. It is the pride of man that is at the bottom of all this opposition. We cannot endure to be like the beasts that perish; and a doubt of the natural immortality of the soul goes right to the citadel of human pride, and is repulsed with scorn and contempt. A minister in our neighborhood said that he would as soon deny the being of God as the immortality of the soul!! "Ye shall be as gods," is an old temptation, but it has not lost its power in the proud heart of man.

Yours, truly, J. P.

East Hanover, May 7, 1856.

Br. J. Blain.—The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you and your family.

I read the works you sent me, (viz., Glad Tidings, &c). I feel very thankful for them; and I would like to get all the works on that subject that can be had. I have examined the Bible on the subject, and with the aid of your work (Death not Life), I am fully convinced of it as the true Bible doctrine: and the more I study into it the more light I get, and the better I feel, &c. But I have some hard opposition. The ministry is against me, and several works were placed before me to disprove it, but none to satisfaction.

Most respectfully yours,

JACOB L. MILLER.

Exposition of Eccl. ix. 4-6.

"For him that is joined to all the living there is hope; for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love and their hatred and envy is now perished: neither have they any more a portion, for ever, in any thing that is done under the sun."

There is a great deal of instruction in the above scripture; it being expressed in language, at once, significant and comprehensive. But what mostly concerns us, is to know what that instruction is: *i. e.* to understand precisely what it proves respecting the condition of the dead absolutely, and their state relatively considered, when being contrasted with that of the living.

The wise man in verse 3, introduces the subject of death, and this with the state of the dead, is continued through the three following verses as the principal of the discourse.

The subject of hope, which consists of desire and expectation, in the first clause of the text, is introduced in such a way, as to carry strong conviction to the understanding, that this faculty of the mind is exercised by the living only, and not by the dead. Were it, according to the prevalent doctrines of men, that death is merely the separation of soul and body, and that their departed souls are in a kind of embryo state of happiness or misery, then the mind of the dead saint must constantly be exercised, not only with a desire, but also with an expectation of the resurrection of the just, when the soul and body would be re-united for the enjoyment of more perfect bliss.

In the last clause of verse 4, a comparison is drawn between the living dog and dead lion. The preference is given to the former. The object is not to instruct us as to the relative condition of living and dead beasts, nor to inform us as to the *absolute* condition of dead animals. We come to this conclusion from the fact that "all Scripture is given by inspiration, and it is profitable for doctrine;" and we do not see how such information *can* be profitable to us. Further, verse 3 shows clearly that the state or condition of the *sons of men* when dead was the subject under consideration. This simile was calculated to show the vast

superiority of the condition of a living man over that of a dead man: or it would be difficult to conceive what instruction it was designed to impart. If the mental faculties of the dead are so vastly superior to those of the living, that one dead man knows more than all the living, as we have formerly been taught, then the above comparison must be very much out of place; for though there be a total loss of physical power in death, yet as the "mind is the stature of the man," according to their teachings, and as "bodily exercise profiteth little," according to sacred writ, such an addition of mental power must more than counterbalance the entire loss of physical, and thus the dead man have the superiority still.

Again, if it be true that the righteous, as soon as they die, become angels, as spiritualism and even the leaders of the so-called orthodox churches assert, (and quote Rev. xxii. 8, 9, to prove it,) then this declaration of Solomon must be rejected at least as an unmeaning figure, if not as a perfect falsehood, as we have a vast amount of testimony from various parts of the Bible, to prove that angels are greatly superior to men. Ps. ciii. 20, says, that angels excel in strength. 2 Peter ii. 11, says, "Whereas angels which are greater in power and might." Greater than whom? Greater than wicked men; and truly all the mighty men are among the wicked and not among the righteous. If any are desirous to know the *degree* of their superiority in these respects, such are referred to the destruction of an armed force of one hundred and eighty-five thousand men by an angel in one night. Isa. xxxvii. 36. They are also referred to Matt. xxviii. 2–4, which shows that there was power in one angel to cause a great earthquake, and also to cause the sentinels placed there to guard the tomb, to shake and become as dead men. Nor are we sure in either of these cases, that all the power of these angels was called into action. The description of the angel of Rev. xviii. 1, in which it is said, "the earth was lighted with his glory," gives us such a clue upon the subject, that our dim perception is enabled to discover something of the immense disparity between the power and majesty of angels and that of men.

The result is as follows:

Solomon gives us to understand that the living man is more than as much superior to the dead as a living dog to a dead lion. The doctrines of men assert that as soon as men die they become angels; and the Bible in various places teaches us, as seen above, that angels are vastly superior to men; therefore if the doctrines of men be true, they make the Bible contradict itself. But whether their doctrines be true or not, *they* contradict the Bible.

As the first clause of the 5th verse expresses the knowledge and certainty of death merely, and therefore needs no comment, I pass to the following sentence: "But the dead know not anything." Here is a simple and positive declaration, without any modifying term whatever. But the objector says, it is the dead body that knows nothing; but the *soul* the *thinking* part of man then knows much more than it did before. * * * But I pass to the next expression in the text. "For the memory of them is forgotten." Here the main point is to know what the true meaning of this last expression is. Does it mean that others have forgotten to remember them? Certainly this is no good reason why the dead have no reward. The wise man says, "neither have they any more a reward;" for, or because the memory of them is forgotten. If the dead still retained their faculties of mind they might have a reward just as well, though all *others* had *forgotten* them. But this is not the meaning. The sense of it is, that the dead have no reward, because their own memory is forgotten, or perished, so that they are wholly incapable of appreciating or receiving, enjoying or suffering any reward. It is true, the phrase, "the memory of them is forgotten," is somewhat peculiar, and is not in exact accordance with the English idiom, but it perfectly agrees with the idioms of some, at least of, the ancient languages.

Again it is contrary to what we know to be *facts*, to say on general principles that the dead are forgotten by the living. Think you that the fond mother who has seen her daughter, just in the opening bloom of youth, droop, die, and housed away in death, will cease to remember with mournful yet fond recollections that darling youth, until all other faculties of her mind shall fail? Most certainly not. Or the affectionate father who has witnessed his youthful son just emerging into manhood, giving promise of distinguished future life, and of being the solace of his own declining years, fall the most unexpected prey to the common destroyer, and become an inmate of the tomb. Think you that this son is forgotten by his parent?

The hero and statesman remember with a proud satisfaction the names and acts of a vast catalogue of heroes and statesmen of other ages which history has brought down to their remembrance.—The humble saint remembers with a holy delight, the names, suffering, and acts of a great multitude of prophets, apostles, and saints, some of whom, wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, and others not accepting deliverance, suffered to the death that they might obtain a better resurrection. Hence we have strong evidence that the dead are not forgotten by the living.

Further, there is not only no evidence that the dead are forgotten by the living, but even if they were, there would be a perfect inconsistency in the idea that the dead have no more a reward *because* the living cease to *remember* them. Could not God reward them just as well as though all men had forgotten them? certainly he could. But if their own powers of mind are gone, of course they are incapable of any reward. And that their faculties are gone, Psalm cxlvi. 4, proves in the most clear and positive language: viz. "His breath goeth forth: he returneth to his earth, in that very day *his thoughts perish.*"

Verse 6. "Also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished." As the objector always will say, that it is the dead *body* that knows nothing, but the *mind*, the *thinking* part that remains intelligent, here let me ask in candor, Are love, hatred, and envy attributes of the body, or of the mind? Any rational man will answer, They are attributes of the mind. Hence it ap-

pears that they have the wrong side of the argument; for the reason that three of those faculties of the mind have perished, which are so essential to its existence, that it would be difficult to conceive how they can perish unless the whole mind perish with them.

If the doctrine alluded to be true, that the thinking part of man goes to a place of happiness or misery at death, we will examine the condition of one who has just reached the world of bliss.—Though his hatred and envy have perished, can any one hence believe that his love is perished also? What! believe as soon as the soul reaches that blissful region where God the Father and Jesus the Saviour dwell in matchless excellence and glory, and where angels, God's most exalted servants dwell in all their loveliness, that then is the time the love of the poor saint must wax cold and perish? When they have left all the hateful snares and unlovely conduct of this world, and have reached the place, where every thing is calculated to bring that faculty of the mind into its most exquisite action, is it rational to believe that this most essential attribute of the mind must then perish? Let any candid man answer.

We will now examine the case of the wicked.—Our opponents have always held forth that the employment of the lost is to blaspheme God's holy name, and vent their hatred and malice against their associates. And here though all admit that their love is *now* perished, yet their envy and hatred must rage without control. The conclusion of the matter is this: The Word says, "their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished." The objector says their love in this case has perished; but their envy and hatred are wrought up to the most active malignity. Here is another plain contradiction of the word of God. Error always brings us into a contradiction with the Bible; but truth brings us into harmony with it.

The usual reply to the above sentiment, is, we make poor man to die like the beasts. Such should be referred to Eccl. iii. 19, 20, to see *how* they die. "For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: As the one dieth so dieth the other, yea they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." Hence in nearly every sentence taken up, we find almost an entire want of harmony between the doctrines of men in the present age, and the word of the Lord. As it respects the application of this truth to Spiritualism, we find here the most complete refutation of that deceitful magic there is in all the Bible. Though the emphatic declaration "The dead know not anything," would seem to be of itself sufficient to refute the false doctrine, we are instructed still further on this point, "that they have no more a reward," that "their memory is forgotten," also that "their love, envy and hatred is now perished:" three faculties so essential to the existence of the mind that one or more of them must exist as long as the mind itself exists: yet the Holy Spirit as if to guard us doubly strong against this fatal error, adds in conclusion, "Neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun."

They not only have no more a portion in any thing that *is* under the sun; but they have no portion in any thing that is *done* under the sun.—Therefore the erroneous teaching that the spirits of the dead are ministering or guardian spirits, and that they rap, write, speak, sing, &c. is completely refuted by this epitome of divine truth on this subject.

How could the poor saint withstand this deceptive fallacy, had it not been for the developement of this truth?

With what gratitude to God should our hearts be exercised, that he has graciously given us, in due time, the doctrine of the unintelligence of the dead so completely adapted to guard us against this strong delusion of the last days which is about to envelope the world.—*Review & Herald.*

Our Visit to Meriden, Conn., was most agreeable, and we hope not unprofitable to the friends. The attendance on Sunday was large and attentive. We formed an agreeable acquaintance with several brethren who were before unknown to us; and we were most hospitably entertained by them and helped on our way *liberally*. Many thanks to them for their kindness. May the Lord enrich them all with his grace. We have been so completely occupied since we were there, in writing our *Review* of Dr. Post on Immortality, that we have neglected to notice our pleasant visit and the kindness of the friends there sooner.

"Six Sermons," *Revised and Enlarged.*—Those who have read this work, have found very much matter not in the *Original:* besides an entire new sermon on "*Christ the Life-Giver.*" In addition to this, it is printed with a large clear type, thus affording much more satisfaction in reading. *Price*, in plain binding, 63 cents: in gilt, $1. We will put eight copies for $3, cash.

The Office of the Bible Examiner is at our *Residence*, 62 *Hicks Street*, Brooklyn; a short distance from *Fulton Ferry:* but in all cases *address* us as follows:

Geo. Storrs,
Box **4658**,
New York.

Usually we can be found at home at all hours except between 9 and 11 o'clock in the morning. We have *an Agency* at 109 *Nassau Street, New York*, in the Book Store of *Fairchild & Co.*, where our works can be had *at retail*, and where orders may be left for us, as we shall call there daily between the hours indicated above. City subscribers who call for their papers will find them there hereafter.

"MAN'S DESTINY.—IMMORTALITY: *the Arguments from Nature and Scripture, by Rev. T. M. Post, D.D., of St. Louis, Mo.;* REVIEWED by GEO. STORRS, *Editor of Bible Examiner*, New York."

Such is the *title* of a Pamphlet soon to be issued. Dr. POST'S arguments might with propriety have been denominated—A PLEA FOR ENDLESS SIN AND SORROW. That is most expressive of their design; being, in fact, a labored effort, by conjectures of possibilities, &c., to put down the doctrine—"All the wicked will God destroy;" and an attempt to establish the idea that to *destroy* does not mean extinction of living existence, but "moral ruin" eternally perpetuated in "immortal sorrow" and "eternal pain."

The author has done the best, and all that the most learned and talented of the advocates for "immortal sorrow" can do to establish that theory. Our Review was written by request, designed, originally, to accompany Dr. POST'S Arguments in a reprint of his work; but as it could not do that without our submitting to certain conditions, to which—after mature deliberation—we could not consent, we declined furnishing the Review for that object.

To prepare it we have spent weeks of confinement and application, which has been a severe tax on our health; and has prevented our furnishing as much *Editorial* for the EXAMINER as, perhaps, we ought.

The Review if published in the EXAMINER would fill at least four entire numbers, perhaps more. To give it to our readers in our regular issues would necessarily occupy several months, besides getting it in detached parts. After reflection upon the subject, and consultation with some of our friends, we have concluded to issue it in a 12mo. Pamphlet, with covers, and send it to all our Subscribers who have paid, or who shall hereafter pay, for the last half of the present volume of the EXAMINER; and that they receive it in place of four numbers of our regular issue: that is, we give them *eight* numbers of the EXAMINER and the *Review* instead of twelve of the EXAMINER, for the last half of this year. By this means they will receive as much or more reading, and get it in a manner more satisfactory to themselves, and will then have the Review entire at once, and by itself. If any feel dissatisfied with this arrangement, and will let us know it, we will give them such satisfaction as they shall claim.

The work will be issued in a few days, and be sent out immediately to all our paying subscribers. The expense of its issue will much exceed that of the regular issue of the EXAMINER. If any are disposed to aid us to meet this extra expense, either by donations or purchasing a quantity of the work for circulation, we shall be obliged to them. We design to arrange so as to be able to print any number that may be called for, at short notice. The price to those that buy, we cannot now state definitely; but it will not exceed 38 cents.

Those who forward money immediately shall have the amount of it returned, at the lowest cash price, soon as the work is issued. If our friends approve the work, we hope they will scatter it by thousands.

Each paying subscriber for the EXAMINER should inquire at his Post-office for "*a pamphlet*," by the first of July. We hope to send them the *Review* by that time, if not before; and the next EXAMINER need not be expected till about the middle of July.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—*This* number of the EXAMINER completes half the year. We hope the few—they are very few—who have paid only to this date will remit $1 for the remainder of the volume, so that they also may have the *Review*, noticed above. If they do not think the Review, *alone*, worth their dollar, and will say so when they have read it, we will send them "*Dobney Abridged*," or "*The Discussion* with Prof. Mattison," *gratis*. And we make the same offer to any *new* subscriber for the last half of the present volume. Money for the EXAMINER is remitted at our risk, if the letter is addressed according to our printed notice; which, see.

BIBLE EXAMINER BOUND FOR 1856.—We shall be able, we expect, to furnish a few *bound* volumes for *this year*, at the close thereof. Those who wish us to do so can secure a copy by remitting $2 for it. Those who remit the amount will be first served till all the volumes are exhausted. They will, also, be entitled to a copy of the *Review* of Dr. POST on Immortality.

All the EXAMINERS of previous years are gone, except some half dozen of 1855, which can be had at $1.50 per copy.

PHINEAS A. SMITH, Rochester, N. Y., keeps our *Original* "Six Sermons" for sale. All persons who wish for these should send to him, as we keep none of them. He sells them, we believe, at one shilling per copy; and $9 per 100. He also keeps the "*Bible vs. Tradition.*" The *Revised and Enlarged* "Six Sermons" we can furnish in any quantity. See notice on the preceding page.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, JULY, 1856. NO. 17.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SAUL AND THE WOMAN AT ENDOR.

[Continued from p. 180.]

2. Let us next scrutinize the *sorceress and her management*, and see what marks of dissimulation and trickery we can detect in her.

She is denominated 'a woman that hath a familiar spirit,'—implying in the language of divination that she was attended by an invisible spirit with whom she was familiar, who was subject to her call, who had power to inspire her when she sought direction, or to bring up the dead that she might learn of them respecting future events.—Now such a pretence as this bears the evidence of "a lying vanity" on the very face of it. We have no proof of the existence of any such fact as a person's having authority and power over an invisible spirit. Spirits are subject to the control of God, but it remains to be shown that they are ever thus put into subjection to the will of man. We must wait till a new system of philosophy and religion is constructed before we can give credit to any such notion. The Seventy, however, denominated her, as we have before said, a *ventriloquist, eggastrimuthos;* and they frequently speak of such persons as speaking from the belly, *oi ek tees koilais phonousin.* "From this it is evident that the art of the *ventriloquist*, so well known now, was known then, and it is highly probable that the secret of the art of the soothsayers consisted very much in this,—in being able to throw the voice with various modifications into different places, so that it would seem to come from a grave, or from an image of a dead person, that was made to appear at the proper time." [Barnes on Isaiah viii, 19.]

The woman pretended, it will be observed, that she did not at all suspect her visitor to be Saul the king, until she discovered it by the power of her art. Let us cross-examine this point a little. Saul, in some fit of zeal, and perhaps to make some atonement for his disobedience in other respects, had recently executed the penalty of the law on those who practiced necromancy and divination; and, as the narrative informs us, "had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards out of the land." Or as some have supposed, he may have taken this measure because they had freely predicted his approaching ruin; although after the well known prophecies of Samuel to that effect, the present position of his affairs, and the growing influence of David, there 'needed no ghost to come from the grave to tell them this.' Whatever the motive, Saul, it seems, had lately cut them off from the land, so that if any now remained, they kept themselves in disguise, and practiced their arts with caution and secrecy. But now the half distracted Saul directs his servants to seek him a woman that had a familiar spirit. "And his servants said to him, Behold, there is a woman that hath a familiar spirit at Endor." How did they know there was such a woman at Endor? Either because they were in her confidence, and perhaps for her advantage and safety, kept her secretly informed of the movements of the king; or, what seems more probable from the narrative, because, in obedience to his directions, they had just traversed the land, and made diligent search for such a woman, till they found her. In either case, there is a strong presumptive evidence that she had heard of the king's wishes and state of mind, and was prepared to expect a call from him. It seems hardly credible, under the circumstances, that inquiry for such a woman should have been made through the land by the king's orders, and she not have heard of it.

But let us follow along the track of the story, and look for further evidence on this point. Saul disguises himself by putting on other raiment, takes with him two men as attendants, and makes his way to the woman's house by night,—the darkness better suiting his disguise, while it would not at all tend to dissipate his superstitious feelings, nor to hinder the success of magic arts.—The night is generally chosen for such craft. Saul arrives at the place, and announces his errand to the woman, by saying, "I pray thee divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and bring me him up, whom I shall name unto thee." Then he stands before her, head and neck taller than any other man in all Israel, or, as the sacred description is, "from his shoulders and upwards he was higher than any of the people," and yet this good honest woman has not the least suspicion who he is! Oh no; it would not be for her advantage to know as much as that just at present. Now such a man might so disguise himself as to pass along the way unrecognized in the night; but could he present himself before an observing, quick-sighted woman, in her own house, without her at least conjecturing in a moment who he was? We give the sex more credit for sharpness, than to believe that. Nor does it appear that he took any particular pains to feign himself another man, after he entered her door, except by keeping on the raiment he had assumed. And there was his *tone of voice*,—had

the woman never heard Saul speak before, that she should not recognize him by that? And then he came with attendants, as if he were a person of some rank. And there was perhaps also the prepaid fee,—he would be likely to hand her such a princely reward as she would only expect from a king, especially as he would naturally anticipate the needed cogency of such a motive to overcome her fear of detection and punishment; for as Henry observes, "though no mention is made of her fee, no doubt she demanded, and had a large one." And yet she pretends not to suspect at all who he is! "Behold, thou knowest," she says,—and no doubt she knew how to suit her tone and manner to the occasion,—"Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, and how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards out of land; wherefore then layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die?" How could she have spoken better, if well knowing who he was, she was artfully seeking to draw from him some pledge of protection? And her aim was successful; for "Saul sware to her by the Lord, saying, as the Lord liveth, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing." Thus he put himself completely in her power, giving her a sworn license to impose upon him with impunity, as much as she would; and well did she improve it. But why did she place so much evident reliance upon his oath, if, as she pretended, she knew not who he was? She was not so stupid as to imagine that such an assurance from an ordinary citizen would afford her any protection against the law and the king. And yet she appears to have been perfectly satisfied with his word, and ready to proceed at his service. What further evidence do we need that in all this she was playing a game of deception with her visitor, and artfully drawing him into her power? And if she could so skillfully act the part of a dissembler and impostor at the outset, she could act it all the way through; and we are prepared to expect more of the same craft from her, as we go on.

Her next artifice is to pretend an awful pain at discovering by the mysterious power of her magic, that her visitor is no other than Saul the king! Resting in the given assurance of safety, she proceeds to ask, "Whom shall I bring up to thee? And he said bring me up Samuel." At this point there is evidently a chasm in the story. We are not told what she did in the meantime; what mysterious divination she pretended to practice; what strange rappings, what horrible peepings and mutterings were heard; what unaccountable table-movings occurred; what spells or enchantments were used to bring up the dead. The sacred writer passes over all this in profound silence, as too ridiculous and absurd to be mentioned. But the next we read is, "And when the woman saw Samuel"—and we can hardly forbear the impression that the narrator means to be understood as relating this in a tone of significant irony—"And when the woman saw Samul, she cried with a loud voice; and the woman spake to Saul saying, Why has thou deceived me? for thou art Saul." This was admirably well turned, and just such a trick as we might expect a cunning sorceress to play. All on a sudden she is terror-struck with the discovery, just that moment made through the wonderful power of her wonderful art, that her visitor is none other than king Saul himself! and in a tone of surprise and consternation, she *screams out* at the top of her voice, as only such a witch could scream. "Why hast thou deceived me?" she gasps out to the startled, awe-smitten man before her, "for thou art Saul"!—as if she had that instant found out by the circuitous way of the invisible world, what she had all along known by the simple use of her senses! A woman who could throw dust in a man's eyes as well as that, may be presumed capable of rendering him totally blind before she has done with him.

But what is the meaning of that '*loud voice*' with which she cried out. Did she intend to be heard all over the house when she vociferated, "for thou art Saul?" Did she wish some person who was secreted in another room, or behind the scenes, for the purpose of acting in collusion with her, to be distinctly and unmistakably informed who her visitor was, that when he came to play the part of Samuel, he might suit his words and actions to the person addressed? for a woman who could deceive the king so far, might deceive him still farther, by pretending that to be the shade of Samuel, which, in reality, was nothing else than the living substance of some cunning person who was stationed in a convenient place to help her carry out her imposition. Is there anything incredible in the supposition that there might have been such an assistant in her secret service; or if not, that she feigned Samuel herself, by the art of ventriloquism, as has been suggested? On either supposition it is not difficult to account for all that occurred, without resorting to the idea of supernatural agency.

It should next be observed that the woman offered Saul no opportunity of *seeing* the pretended apparition. She was so kind as to do all the *seeing* herself, while she merely left him to do the *hearing*. For when she professed to be surprised and alarmed at discovering who Saul was, he said unto her, "Be not afraid; for what sawest thou?" implying that *he himself saw nothing*. "And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods ascending out of the earth." This was taking a new advantage of her victim. Her reply was another cunning device for throwing an air of mystery around her craft, and deceiving the king into the idea of something marvellous. Gods ascending out of the earth! What an absurdity! But poor Saul was already too much blinded too see it. "And he said unto her, what form is he of?"—still implying that he saw nothing himself, and that his only thought was of Samuel. "And she said, An old man cometh up; and he is covered with a mantle." Probably she had many a time seen the living Samuel, and knew how to give such a description of his personal appearance and dress, as Saul would immediately recognize. "And Saul perceived"—it is not said that he *saw* or *beheld*; but he *perceived* or understood by the description —"that it was Samuel; and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself." In the original the reading is, "And Saul perceived that

it was Samuel *himself*"—the latter word being omitted by our translators. Some critics have laid great stress upon this pronoun *himself*, as going to show that the veritable Samuel must, in some form, have been there. But we regard it as only another significant, if not ironical stroke of the writer, designed to make the delusive impression on Saul's mind appear the more preposterous; as much as to say, 'so bewildered and demented was Saul, that he verily thought it to be the identical Samuel *himself*.'

This is enough to show the cunning adroitness of the woman, and that she was successfully imposing upon Saul's imagination by mere trickery.

3. We now take up *the pretended apparition itself*, to see how much of the veritable Samuel we can find in that; Saul, the meanwhile, be it remembered, seeing no shade or ghost of Samuel himself, but only *hearing*, from first to last, what he supposed to be his voice.

And we are disposed, at the outset, to question somewhat the soundness of our apparition's views respecting *the state of the dead*. He began by asking Saul, "Why hast thy disquieted me, to bring me up?" Bring him up from whence?—Samuel was buried at Ramah, some fifty or sixty miles distant from Endor; and we should, therefore, hardly expect him to speak in this manner of being brought up bodily from the grave. This evidently was not the intended meaning of the supposed ghost; but he adopts the old pagan notion that departed spirits have their abode *beneath the earth*, in a certain imaginary *under-world*, where they rest for the present in a sort half-conscious, lethargic state, from which Samuel is represented as being aroused at the request of Saul. If Samuel himself had actually come from the spirit-world to converse with Saul, we think he would not have made such a blunder as to talk about being disturbed in his rest or quietude, or to speak of being *brought up* from some imaginary shades beneath, instead of being *brought down* from the realms of light and glory, where such godly men as he are received to dwell with Christ. We cannot but think that our ghost shows himself none too intelligent for one who comes directly from the invisible world, and who must be supposed to known much more about it than we mortals on earth, who have nothing but our Bibles to inform us. And we are sometimes provoked to question, whether many of the professed spirits that are brought up in these days, have improved their advantages and learned as much from their intercourse with the other world as might have been expected. But the deluded Saul perceived no incongruity, or marks of pagan ignorance, in the question of the supposed Samuel; and he seriously replied to it, "I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war with me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams; therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do."

We are next disposed to question the superior knowledge of the unseen apparition concerning the condition and prospects of Saul. What did he tell him that might not have been equally well told by almost any common person, who was tolerably acquainted with the facts which must, at that time, have generally been known in Israel? What more than what might have been told at this day, who is familiar with the history of Saul's reign? The pretended Samuel proceeds to say, "Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? And the Lord hath done to him—done for himself—as he spake by me; for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbor, even to David; because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day." It needed no spirit from the other world to remind Saul of all this; for who in Israel did not know of his disobeying the word of the Lord in regard to Amalek, and of the rebuke and warning that Samuel gave him on the occasion, when he said, "The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbor of thine that is better that thou?"—and every one understood that neighbor to be David.

But now the hidden spectre ventures upon the more hazardous experiment of offering a *prediction*; and here we shall find him more cautious and wary in his mode of expression. "Moreover the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me; the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines." Here are two events foretold which appear to have been subsequently fulfilled; one is, that the Philistines would gain the battle in the coming encountre; the other is, that Saul and his sons would be with the supposed Samuel, be this expression understood as t may.

In regard to the first, it may be said, that in the existing posture of affairs, nothing was more probable. The Philistines had already gathered together their whole army against Israel, under the conduct of Achish, the powerful king of Gath. David and his six hundred brave warriors were with them in the field, had fought victoriously in their battles, appeared to be in their interest, and as they had been outlawed and treated as enemies by Saul, it was but natural to suppose that they would now serve as allies to the Philistines in the approaching struggle, although, as the event proved, they did not. And it was also well understood that the Lord had chosen and appointed David to the kingdom, and that a crisis to that end must be near at hand. Add to all this, that Saul himself, as his remark had just shown, was strongly apprehensive of defeat; was exceedingly depressed in spirits, feeling that God had departed from him; and that his men of war, knowing how things stood, and having their confidence in him and his cause greatly weakened on account of his scandalous treatment of David, partook of the same foreboding and disheartening frame of mind; and what was more to be expected than that the Philistines would win the day? What great risk was there in predicting such an issue? And if the Philistines triumphed, what was more probable than that Saul and his sons would be singled out

for slaughter? Saul would readily be distinguished by his stature, and perhaps both he and his sons by their royal armor and commanding station.

But aside from this probability, the form of expression, 'to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me,' is very ambiguous, as the responses of heathen oracles almost always, and designedly, are. For example, "when Crœsus was on the point of invading the Medes, he consulted the oracle of Delphi on the success of that war, and was answered, that by passing the river Halys he would ruin a great empire. What empire, his own or that of his enemies? He was to guess that; but whatever the event might be, the oracle could not fail of being in the right." So of the same god's answer to Pyrrus: "Aio te, Æacida, Romanos vincere posse." Similar is the example before us. The expression might be construed to mean either this thing or that, to suit the event. In the first place, it is not clear that Saul's death did occur on the morrow, or the very next day after this prediction. In the next place, the word *to-morrow* is, in the Hebrew, quite ambiguous; in some passages meaning to-morrow in the common acceptation of the term, in others meaning the future indefinitely. As in Exodus we read, "It shall be when thy son asketh thee *in time to come*." In the margin it stands 'to-morrow,' the same word that is used here. And so in Joshua, "When your children ask their fathers *in time to come*"—Hebrew, 'to-morrow'—"what mean ye by these stones?" &c. And so in other instances. Had the event, therefore, made it convenient to understand the prediction to be, '*in time to come* shalt thou and thy sons be with me,' there is nothing in the language to hinder such an interpretation.—The cunning ghost does not venture even so far as to say that Saul and his sons *would be slain in battle;* and whether they died the next day, or a month, or a year, or ten years afterwards, the prediction, in point of time, could not turn out amiss. In like manner the phrase, "*shalt be with me*," might be understood to mean this thing or that thing. Should the event require it, it might be construed to mean, 'thou shalt be with me among the dead, or in the other world.' But here again we might question the correctness of the apparition's religious views, in supposing that such a man as Saul would be admitted to the same society as the holy Samuel in the other world. Or if Saul had not happened to be slain in battle, but had lived for years afterwards, the woman might have claimed that the expression was intended to mean 'thou shalt be with me among the living;' for if she pretended that Samuel, though dead, was now among the living, she might pretend the same thing again, employing the second lie to save the first, as is very common. Putting the whole expression together, therefore, it was capable of being twisted into almost any shape that the witch might desire; as, 'To-morrow thou shalt be with me among the dead,'—or, 'In time to come thou shalt be with me among the dead,'—or, 'To-morrow, or in time to come, thou shalt be with me among the living.' The prediction, it must be acknowledged, was pretty ingeniously framed; but when we try to pin it down to some definite point, it proves, after all, to be a very slippery affair.

On the whole, then, do we need any further evidence that the woman's pretended Samuel, whom the king from beginning to end was not privileged to see with his eyes, was all a cheat; and that the sacred writer expected it to be so understood, purposely adopting the style he has in relating the story, to make the whole thing appear the more ridiculous and contemptible? And what is this but a fair specimen of the real character of all manner of pretended divination, or communicating with departed spirits, whether in ancient or modern times? There may be, and probably are at times, some phenomena connected with such arts that cannot easily be explained; and phenomena of this kind are purposely caught up and mingled with the trickery, because they help to give it an air of marvelousness. But it is too much to believe that there is anything supernatural or miraculous in these things.

We need not, however, stay to make that application of this narrative to the pretensions of modern spiritualists of which it is capable. The thing speaks for itself. It is one example illustrating the deceivableness of all arts of the kind, and showing that they alike deserve to be treated with the same incredulous ridicule and contempt. They are lying, mischievous cheats throughout; and as wicked as they are false and demoralizing. We say to our friends, let them alone; let them perish in disgrace for want of attention. God's holy religion makes known to us all that we need to know, ought to know, or can know, of spirits and the unseen world; and affords us the only safe guide to wisdom, happiness, and heaven.

The melancholy example of Saul shows that an unsettled state of religious faith and character; a fickle, unscrupulous recreant in duty; a restless, unhappy, foreboding conscience, is precisely adapted to render a person superstitious, and to lay him open to the arts of the impostor. It is a fearful thing to get into such a state; to have no settled confidence in God and his word; no well grounded principles and habits of religion; no freedom of access to the throne of divine grace in heaven's appointed way; no truthful and abiding source of happiness within,—let a person get into such a state, and he is ready to believe almost anything but the truth; to be duped by almost anything that appeals to his wild and sceptical religiousness of feeling and credulity. If we would escape the power of deceivers and be wise, we must have faith in God and his testimony; be satisfied to know his revealed will, and to walk in his ways; keeping the heart pure and honest in its convictions, and the time and thoughts occupied with the performance of plain, unquestionable duty.

Our next issue of the Examiner will be about the middle of August. In the interval we design spending a week or ten days in Philadelphia and its vicinity.

Br. Hall's fourth rejoinder shall have place in our next issue. Br. Grew and Macknight Jr. were before him for this number.

Reply No. 2 to Mackn

The Christian spirit
so well adapted to secu
his arguments, is duly a
1. I must remark fir
that my "conceptions
question at issue, are
what David, or any oth
enemies, but from the
word of the Lord. "I
ther (Grew) in all sinc
the real scriptural sig
here cited, presents no
second death." I reply
all. What is "the real
of the testimony cited
be affirmed that the "
tion" must certainly ref
cause it is what the wi
pared. That this is th
and fully admitted; but
God has threatened no
teral sense of that term)
process of reasoning c
"pit" or "net" of "d
men prepare for the rig
sure of divine justice" d
What kind of a standar
Is the destruction and
justice assigns the inco
termined by the praye
the plain and positive d
the Lord? What "di
admitting that the wicke
fall into the snares of
their present destruction
resurrection of condemn
be cast into the lake of
death?" Rev. 20 chap.
pected friend an exami
which so plainly teache
towards the wicked who
have "no bonds in thei
the revealed purpose o
hereafter according to th
be "utterly consumed
which certainly cannot
conscious: a doom perfe
testimony of "the faithfu
5: 28, 29, and Math. 10
2. I submit that my fri
argument intended to sh
our Lord, Luke 20: 37,
unto him" refers to the r
disprove his own testim
that "ALL which are i
his voice and come forth,
mit that the wicked are
sons who come forth "to
demnation." I ask him to
I presume he will admit
ever referred to, "live un
resurrection; for our Lo
there is no resurrection, G
the dead. Now, as it is
teaches a "resurrection"

Reply No. 2 to Macknight, Jr. By H. Grew.

The Christian spirit of my brother's response, so well adapted to secure a calm examination of his arguments, is duly appreciated.

1. I must remark first to my intelligent friend, that my "conceptions of truth" relative to the question at issue, are derived, not simply from what David, or any other person, invoked for his enemies, but from the plain declarations of the word of the Lord. "I would ask my dear brother (Grew) in all sincerity, (he writes) whether the real scriptural significance of the testimony here cited, presents no difficulty to *his* view of the second death." I reply "in all sincerity," none at all. What is "the real and scriptural significance of the testimony cited and emphasised? It will be affirmed that the "pit" or "net" of "destruction" must certainly refer to the present state, because it is what the wicked man had himself prepared. That this is the real significance is freely and fully admitted; but how does this prove that God has threatened no "second death" (in the literal sense of that term) for the wicked? By what process of reasoning can it be shown, that the "pit" or "net" of "destruction" which wicked men prepare for the righteous, is "the fullest measure of divine justice" due to impenitent sinners? What kind of a standard of divine justice is this? Is the destruction and entire punishment, divine justice assigns the incorrigibly wicked, to be determined by the prayers of the righteous, or by the plain and positive declaration of the word of the Lord? What "difficulty," I ask, is there in admitting that the wicked may, in the present state, fall into the snares of their own evil devices, to their present destruction, and "come forth—to the resurrection of condemnation," John 5 : 28, 29 to be cast into the lake of fire to suffer "the second death?" Rev. 20 chap. I commend to my respected friend an examination of the 73d Psalm which so plainly teaches that the justice of God towards the wicked who prosper in this world and have "no bonds in their death," is manifested by the revealed purpose of God to deal with them hereafter according to their works, when they will be "utterly consumed with TERRORS;" a doom which certainly cannot be predicated of the *unconscious:* a doom perfectly harmonizing with the testimony of "the faithful Witness" both in John 5 : 28, 29, and Math. 10 : 28.

2. I submit that my friend has not answered my argument intended to show that, even admitting our Lord, Luke 20 : 37, in the words, "ALL live unto him" refers to the righteous only; it cannot disprove his own testimony, on another occasion, that "ALL which are in their graves shall hear his voice and come forth," &c. My friend will admit that the wicked are here included, as the persons who come forth "to the resurrection of condemnation." I ask him to consider, however, what I presume he will admit, that the persons, whoever referred to, "live unto him" *because of this resurrection;* for our Lord's argument is, that if there is no resurrection, God would be the God of the dead. Now, as it is undeniable that our Lord teaches a "resurrection" of those "that have done evil." John 5 : 29 and it is on the ground of a resurrection that the dead are said to live unto God, by what authority do we limit the word "all" to one class in Luke 20 : 38? What I "*confidently*" insist upon however, is, that even admitting the righteous only to be alluded to in the text, his paraphrase contains what the text does not.—As to what my friend remarks about "orthodox expositions," and my "after thought" &c. I would observe he dissents too much himself from "orthodox expositors" to require my accordance with them; and that the question to be determined, is not whether my thoughts are *fore*-thoughts or *after*-thoughts, but whether they are *true* thoughts.

3. My friend is entirely mistaken in supposing that I shall admit that the text referred to, or any other, "is the *only* direct argument in the Bible which embraces in its logic the fact that all the dead, regardless of moral character, will be made alive." "Direct," Webster informs us, means, "plain, express, not ambiguous." I affirm that the testimony that the wicked will suffer a second death, is a *plain, unambiguous* expression, that they "will be made alive" after the first; for otherwise, it is impossible they should "be hurt of the second death."—Rev. 20 : 14; 21 : 8; 2 : 11. If, with the orthodox, we say death means something else than a cessation of life, we might also reject the literal construction of an affirmation that the wicked dead shall be made alive. I affirm also that the divine testimony that "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad"—that "God will render to every man according to his deeds—tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil—in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," &c., is as plain a testimony as the words the wicked shall be alive on that day, for it is manifestly *impossible* that the wicked should receive "tribulation and anguish" in that day unless they are then alive. I have in my former article, referred my brother to other passages each of which I submit, "embraces in its logic" the fact disputed. We need not contend about the strict import of the term "direct" in this connection. The question is—Is the testimony *conclusive? Inferential* testimony may be as conclusive as that which is positive. Suppose I affirm that John and Henry were in a boat, one of them was drowned. John was not drowned. This testimony is as conclusive that Henry was drowned, as if I had said, Henry was drowned. Such is the testimony of "the second death" in relation to the question at issue, in the connection in which that term stands in several passages.

4. Our brother proceeds, "Then came to him certain of the Sadducees, (which deny that there is any resurrection) and asked him, etc. What resurrection, let me inquire, did the Sadducees 'deny.' *That which Jesus taught,* will be the ready answer of all." Well written, Bro. Macknight. Now then, he that hath ears to hear, let him hear Jesus. "ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done

evil to the resurrection of condemnation." Surely we need not refer to "the cavils and to the inquiry of the Sadducees" to explain this luminous testimony.

5. My friend mistakes in supposing that I cannot now hold the same view of Luke 20 : 35, 36 which I did "in (my) response to Bro. Grim." Here our Lord manifestly refers to the righteous only, who will have part in the first resurrection, which will be out of, or from among, dead ones.—There is, however, no impropriety in our Lord first speaking of the resurrection of the righteous, and then of the dead in general. I certainly stated the truth when I affirmed that verse 37 does not read that "the (*righteous*) dead are raised." How does my brother prove that I thereby insinuate a sophism?" He objects to my supposing that verse 37 in connection with the 38th verse, which declares, "he is not a God of the dead but of the living, for ALL live unto him," "*necessarily* includes the wicked," because "Paul declares, 1 Cor. 15 : 52, THE DEAD shall be raised INCORRUPTIBLE;" and asks "How does my brother exclude the *wicked* from this statement?" He answers for me, correctly, and adds, "this is precisely what I would say of our Lord's declaration, "Now that the dead are raised." I submit now, that the supposed "sophism" is not fairly "disposed of," until our brother has proved that our Lord's conversation with the Sadducees as manifestly excludes all references to the resurrection of the wicked as the writing of Paul 1 Cor. 15. There is nothing in the animating testimony of the apostle in this chapter on the subject of the resurrection, to compare with our Lord's words, "For he is not a God of the dead but of the living for all live unto him." I am indeed aware that some consider his words, "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive" are a plainer reference to the resurrection of the wicked. It appears to me however that the words "IN Christ" clearly disprove this, as none but the righteous are "asleep in Christ." 1 Cor. 15 : 18.

6. The glorious truth that the righteous shall hear Christ's voice and come forth to the resurrection of life by the power of the Holy Spirit (by which Christ does all his works) which dwelleth in the saints, is perfectly harmonious with his truth that the wicked also shall hear his voice and come forth "to the resurrection of condemnation," by the power of the same spirit which does *not* dwell in them. "Let (Christ) be true."

7. My respondent considers me assuming that the words, "I am the God of Abraham," &c., imply *only* a relation common to all men. This is a mistake. I remarked, that "the phrases that God is the God of Abraham, &c., and 'the God of the spirits of all flesh,' are *abstractly* considered, equally significant, although other passages plainly teach that he is the God of the former, in an important sense in which he is not the God of th latter. I understand the words to imply both th common and the peculiar relationship; but to suppose the doctrine of the resurrection is *exclusively* founded on the peculiar relationship of Abraham, &c., as their covenant God promising them an eternal inheritance, is to contradict Jesus Christ who as positively declares a resurrection to condemnation as a resurrection to eternal life. It contradicts Paul also, who declared a "resurrection both of the just and the unjust." To harmonize the holy scriptures, we must allow a general resurrection of men, founded on their common relationship to God as their Creator, moral Governor and JUDGE, and a resurrection to eternal life founded on a peculiar relationship as his redeemed children. My intelligent friend will now perceive that my view of the passage involves no such "incongruities" as he has supposed.

8. Although I have offered some argument to prove that our Lord's words to the Sadducees, "all live unto him" may be considered as applying to the dead in general, I am not confident that this is the true construction. I am confident however, that our Lord's construction on this occasion does not involve the doctrine of my friend's paraphrase, viz : that "they that have done evil shall (*not*) come forth to the resurrection of condemnation." I offer this plain declaration of Him whose word cannot pass away, in opposition to all my brother's ingenious and elaborate reasoning on this subject, as far more conclusive than any argumentation I can present him.

9. Will my friend have the kindness to inform me how he reconciles his view with this positive testimony of the Saviour, that the wicked shall hear his voice and come forth "to the resurrection of condemnation"—with the testimony of the inspired apostle who allowed a "resurrection both of the just and the unjust"—with the fact revealed in the 73d Psalm that the ungodly who prosper in this life and have "no bonds in their (first) death," are to be "utterly consumed with terrors"—with the inspired testimony in Rom. 2 chap. that God "will render to every man according to his deeds"—"*tribulation and anguish* upon every soul of man that doeth evil"—"IN THE day (or period) when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ;" and especially with the repeated testimonies of a "second death," reserved for those whose names are not in the book of life. Rev. 2 : 11 ; 20 : 14 ; 21 : 8. If my beloved brother Storrs had succeeded in reconciling these divine testimonies with his position relative to this important subject, I would not have "*reproduced*" them. I have given up theological views which I own I held with tenacity, but my brethren must offer something far more convincing than any thing yet presented to change my mind on this subject. Independently of the texts above referred to, to which I could make a considerable addition, my mind is deeply impressed with the belief, that the glory of the divine government and the manifestation of his justice and righteousness, before the intelligent universe, demand "that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." Acts 24 : 15.

Respectfully submitted; "Let brotherly love continue." HENRY GREW.

Philadelphia, May 30th, 1856.

10. N. B. My authority for understanding "*ék neckron*" "out of or from dead ones," is Groves' Greek and English Dictionary.

[Under date of "June 2d" Bro Grew sent us the the following, requesting us to "add" it to his "reply to Macknight, Jr."—ED. EX.]

Brother Storrs has called my attention to the error of the superfluous "if," which reminds me of my omitting to answer the following questions proposed by Macknight, Jr.

"Now, if Bro. Grew refuses to understand by "THE DEAD," of whom "God is not the God," (Luke 20: 38) *the deceased wicked*, how can he show from the book of Moses that "God is NOT a God of the (eternally) DEAD?"

I reply, that our Lord's reasoning on the words of Moses clearly shows that God is not the God of the eternally dead without reference to character. God is not the God of the eternally dead whether righteous or otherwise. This view harmonizes with the fact that the Sadducees denied "that there is ANY resurrection," either of the righteous or the wicked. It was no question with them whether one class would rise and the other not. They *were* "silenced therefore by an appeal to the book of Moses." Our Lord's reference to Abraham, &c., was to meet the error of the Sadducees, that there was no resurrection at all. The words Abraham, &c., indeed only prove the resurrection of the righteous, but this is not proof of the non-resurrection of the wicked, or that the words "all live unto him" do not include the wicked, whose resurreetion other passages may clearly demonstrate. There appears to me no ground for my friend's representation that in this conference with the Sadducees "our Lord exhibited the righteous and the wicked *in contrast*." I am glad that Br. Storrs acknowledges the resurrection of the latter, in some sense; this is some important approximation to a truth which it appears to me the justice of the divine government requires.

The following article we copy from "*The Independent*" of this city, of June 12th. We presume it is from the pen of Bro. C. F. HUDSON, of Ohio.

IS DEATH OF NATURE?

To the Editors of the Independent:—We often hear of death as a "debt of nature." A doctrine, this, of Christless men, a pagan notion, the theology of which is Naturalism. Death, we are told, is not strictly the penalty of sin; it is not an evil, save as all evil is incipient and imperfect good. In Theodore Parker's doctrine of a "perfect Providence," and in most Universalist schemes of human destiny, we find the same notion, that bodily dissolution is not the result of a Fall, but the natural way to an after life. Unhappily, the Scriptural doctrine of death is now so unsettled, that the pagan idea is allowed to pass, like coins worn smooth, current by force of custom.

In your reply to an inquirer, under the title of "Perplexity," (May 8th,) you seem to me to have hardly replaced this doctrine with coin from the King's mint. You say: "Are there any 'texts which seem to imply' that if there had been no sin, there would have been no dissolution of this bodily organization? * * * that without sin the 'living organism' would have undergone no change analogous to that which we now call death? * * * [that it] is not in its very nature temporary, to be dropped when it has saved its purpose as leaves fall from the trees in autumn, or as a 'shock of corn cometh in its season.' Is there any text which teaches more than that it is by sin that the dissolution of the body, at the departure of the spirit to its future life, becomes the terror and the agony which men call death?"

According to this view, the sentence, "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return" might have been literally fulfilled, though man had not sinned: and that sentence became *penal*, simply because death became painful and terrible. The expulsion from Eden, and from the tree of life, had nothing to do with the dissolution of the body.—The Patriarch David might have been "gathered to his fathers," and have seen "corruption," if the race were unfallen; for the body, having served its temporary purpose, must needs decay, and be buried. And when Christ followed man into the grave to gain a victory over the last "enemy," He stooped no lower than our bodies, which like autumn leaves, would have dropped, by the law of our original nature. He has not changed the appointed course of our physical nature—he has only smoothed our path, or dispelled the darkness that rested upon it. He has saved us, not from the grasp of Death, but from being roughly handled by him; that is, from his enmity. By the Redemption, we are released from his dominion, more happily, perhaps more speedily; whereas without sin, we should still have entered his domain; and without a Redemption, we should have been—we know not what.

I will not say that this view of death is akin to that taken by Emanuel Swedenborg, to which Calvin has given undesigned occasion in his definition of the "first resurrection."* See his "Psychopannychy.") My difficulty is simply this—we are not told, in the above statement, what would have been man's physical destiny, if he had not sinned. *What change would have accomplished that which now depends upon the Resurrection?* What was the relation of the unfallen "natural body" to the "spiritual body?" Was the translation of Enoch an example of man's proper destiny, or an exception from it? Will the bodies of those who are "changed" at Christ's second coming, be transformed, or will they perish? These questions are important as they relate to that primary doctrine of the Gospel—the Resurrection, which the pagan mind could neither mock at or defy, but which is, more than any other religious tenet, *peculiar* to Christianity. When the Scripture doctrine of death is illustrated by it, your inquirer will, perhaps, be still less "perplexed."

I shall not offer, instead of your solution, any

* The definition given by Calvin to which I allude is in this wise, that the "first resurrection" is that of the regenerate soul, immediately after the death of the body, to be succeeded by the "second resurrection," that of the body at the judgment.

of the vagaries of ancient or modern Chiliasm.—And I am no Psychopannychist or Psycotomist. I know some of the difficulties of a true doctrine of the relation of matter and spirit, in the nature and destiny of man. I am indifferent to many points of detail; *e. g.*, whether the "tree of life" had medicinal, ambrosial virtue, as Whately holds, or was symbolic and sacramental. But I am confident that modern philosophy has obscured the Scripture doctrine of man's original destiny, to the advantage of skepticism and error.

To show how the early Christians thought on on this subject, I offer the following from Athanasius, the so-called Father of Orthodoxy, which might be supported by varied citations:

"God desired man to continue in incorruption. But men, neglecting and departing from the knowledge of God, and devising and regarding that which was evil, incurred the threatened condemnation of death. They remained no longer such as they were created, but contracted corruption according to their own devices, and came under the power and dominion of death. For by transgression they reverted to their native condition; so that as from non-existence they had begun to be, they must now in due time suffer the loss and destruction of their being. And that justly; for if, having once the nature of non-being, they were called into being by the presence and goodness of the Word, when they divested themselves of the knowledge of God and turned aside to non-entities, (for evil things are not entities, but good things are entities, seeing they are from God, who truly is,) it followed that they must be also divested of the nature of existing forever. That is, they must perish, and remain in death and corruption. For man is by nature mortal, in that he was created from non-being. Yet, as made in the likeness of the true Being, to be preserved by the knowledge of Him, he might have escaped the force of corruption, and remained immortal."—*De Incarnat. Verbi;* Opp, Ed. Commel, p. 40.

C. F. H.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, July, 1856.

THE ENGLISH TRACTS, from which we have at different times given extracts, have some good things in them; but they have also a spirit of positiveness on some points which we cannot approve in any one writing on prophecy. Almost every one who takes it upon them to write on this branch of scripture is betrayed, sooner or later, into this positive spirit. This writer complains of the misapplication of prophecy by others, and like most others never sees his own errors. We like an expression of opinion on the prophecies; but a positive spirit we abhor. Not one writer have we seen, yet, but what has been demonstrated to be wrong in various particulars. All this is nothing against them, provided it had been but an expression of opinion. A different spirit must disgust the reader, sooner or later, as he discovers the errors which the writer does not acknowledge, or his endeavors to make it appear he was right, though it is palpable to all impartial men that he was wrong. In his tract for December last, this English writer stated positively that the French Emperor would "never quit Sebastopol." In a tract issued in April he says, "Sebastopol is gone by and is heard of no more." This was said, however, not as a confession of his own mistake, but in contempt of some other writer who thought Sebastopol might be Armageddon.

Again, to show how wise he is, he adds, "Two years ago we said that even America would be drawn into the quarrel by the machinations of our enemy; and we are now on such terms with America as render disunion between the two nations inevitable." How foolish thus to speak.

These positive statements in a writer on prophecy give a sort of disgust for all he says, even though he may say some things valuable. On unfulfilled prophecy modesty becomes us all.—Let us give our opinions as briefly as may be, but not attempt to force them on others in a positive spirit, for we may thereby defeat our own object, if our object is to help others, and not to exalt ourselves. The "inevitable disunion between the two nations"—England and America—*seems* to have been avoided. We think this writer is too anxious to discover his wisdom, by laying out, too much in detail, events which may possibly come to pass, or they may not. Many such failures will destroy all confidence in his judgment.

These remarks are equally applicable to some writers on prophecy in this country; and they, in our opinion, would show more wisdom by speaking on the unfulfilled prophecies with less positiveness. We know we do not say as much on prophecy as some wish us to; but we fear we have said too much sometimes, and intend to be more cautious in future. Our opinion of the *character* of the various dynasties of Europe is unchanged. Our expectations of the *immediate* result in their destinies have, in some measure, been disappointed; but our readers all know it has been a uniform practice with us to give our views of this matter as opinion, and to add, "we wait for the developments"—"time must determine."

Response to H. Grew's Second Reply.

BY MACKNIGHT, JR.

[See page 197.]

1. For the purpose of convenient reference, I have numbered the sections of my brother's Reply. I also number the paragraphs of this Response, but the reader is requested to bear in mind that corresponding numbers in the Reply and Reponse have no connection with each other. In answering Bro. GREW, I shall not follow in the order of his article, but refer to its sections, when necessary, by citing the number of the one upon which I am remarking or to which I may wish to call attention.

2. It may be proper that I should state here, that after I had carefully considered the contents of Bro. G.'s "Reply No. 2," I sent him, over my proper name, a letter of strictures upon it, to which my dear brother promptly replied. I thank him for the Christian spirit which characterizes both his letter to me and the Reply, which is the occasion of this Response. "Brotherly love" will "continue" among us, despite our differences of opinion on some doctrines, if Bro. G.'s worthy example of uniform brotherly forbearance, is allowed to exert its appropriate influence upon the hearts, tongues and pens of his readers. To the private correspondence between Bro. G. and myself, (already mentioned,) I shall occasionally allude in this Response; the reader will of course understand such allusions when they occur. Without further preliminary remarks, I invite attention to the points which will properly claim first attention as long as Br. G. and myself have anything to say upon them.

3. In the EXAMINER for April 1st, (not March 15th, as erroneously stated in my former response,) I offered a paraphrase on Luke 20: 37, 38, in which, in connection with remarks subjoined, it was claimed that by "the dead" of verse 37th was meant the deceased righteous; that the relationship brought to view "at the bush," in the words "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," (upon which relationship exclusively our Lord, in his conference with the Sadducees, founded the doctrine "that the dead are raised,") was peculiar to the righteous; that by "the dead" in verse 38th was meant the eternally dead, *viz.*, the deceased wicked; and that by "the living" in verse 38th was meant the temporarily dead, or, all who shall ever be "made *alive*" from the dead. Bro. Grew, in his Reply to my article, assumed unqualifiedly that the resurrection of the dead "*in general*" was the subject of consideration between our Lord and the Sadducees, thus affirming that the deceased wicked are included in the words "the dead" in Luke 20: 37. In my Response to Bro. G., I regarded him as having assumed that the relationship of Jehovah which is expressed in the declaration "I am the God of Abraham," &c. was "*Common* to all men," and *exclusively* such. Bro. G. now informs us (see sec. "7") that I erred in imputing this ground to him; but I think his charge is an invalid one.—To determine this point, I have only to ask the reader's careful attention to the seventh paragraph of Bro. G.'s first Reply; the language there employed by our brother, it will be seen, is meaningless except on the supposition that the "*peculiar* relationship" was not, in Bro. G.'s judgment, a fact which formed part of the Saviour's proof of a resurrection in his interview with the Sadducees. With what propriety, on any other supposition, could Bro. G. remark, as he did, that the "important sense" in which God was peculiarly "the God" of the righteous, was "plainly" taught in "*other* passages?" Why the referrence to "*other* passages" if he was not unwilling to see a peculiar relationship in Luke 20: 37? I am aware that the sentence in question contains the words "*abstractly* considered," but I submit to every candid person that Bro. G.'s own name would be no more irrelevant than those words are in the connection in which they occur. I do not say that Bro. G., in his first Reply, *intended* to exclude the "*peculiar* relationship" from the declaration "I am the God of Abraham," &c., but I am confident his language will not fairly bear any other construction, and because I think so, I must insist that the "mistake" on this point was Bro. G.'s in not stating explicitly how he wished to be understood. But what is Bro. G.'s present position on this question of relationship? Alas, 'tis quite impossible for me to tell; and I do not see that Bro. G. will himself ever be able to tell us so long as he is undecided as to what Luke 20: 37, 38 *does* teach, and at the same time confidently affirms that it does *not* teach the doctrine of my paraphrase.—What he affirms in one place respecting these texts, he questions in another, and fairly contradicts in the third! Let us now see whether this statement is warranted by the facts; Bro. G.'s own words shall judge him.

4. In the Reply before us, (sec. "7,") referring to the declaration "I am the God of Abraham," &c., Bro. G. says—"I understand the words to imply both the common and the peculiar relationship." Again—"we must allow a general resurrection of men, founded on their common relationship to God as their Creator, moral Governor, and JUDGE, and a resurrection to eternal life founded on a peculiar relationship as his redeemed children." In these affirmations of Bro. G., let it be observed that he does not, by a single word of qualification, intimate that he has *doubts* of their correctness. We will now consider the grounds here assumed and endeavor to expose their fallacy. This can be done in few words, as we shall see. Let the following statement be considered, *viz:* If (in keeping with Bro. G.'s position) the "*common* relationship secures the revival of all men from the dead, *it* must secure "the resurrection of life" mentioned in John 5: 29—in which case the "*peculiar* relationship," being unnecessary, could not exist. Any relationship of our Heavenly Father to his sleeping saints which brings them to life, (which Bro. G. declares the "*common* relationship" does,) must make them *immortal* and *incorruptible*, and thus render their "*eternal* life" inevitable.—The righteous dead, after they are once "made alive," *cannot* "die any more," and to them, therefore, the "*peculiar* relationship," which secures nothing which is not made certain by the "*common*,"

is a meaningless affair. If Bro. G. is correct in saying that, in the case of the righteous, the "*peculiar* relationship" is necessary to *perpetuate* the life which a "*common* relationship" secures, it follows inevitably that there must also be a "*peculiar* relationship" to the wicked to accomplish the post-resurrection, "tribulation and anguish" and subsequent destruction which Bro. G. believes awaits them. That all men have a "common relationship to God as their Creator, moral Governor and JUDGE," is undeniable; but all attempts to extort *such* a relationship from JEHOVAH'S declaration "at the bush," ("I am the God of Abraham,") &c., must fail, as has been abundantly shown. I have not the slightest idea that my beloved brother Grew will ever be able "to harmonize the holy Scriptures" on this subject, even to his own satisfaction, until he sees clearly that *the* "relationship," and the *only* one, upon which a revival from the dead is predicated in this discourse to the Sadducess, is "peculiar" to the people of God.

5. After what has been said in the last paragraph, I am happy to be able to say that Bro. G. himself expresses *doubts* of the validity of his two-fold-relationship theory as being contained in Luke 20: 37! In his letter to me he says: "On your further remarks on the 'common and peculiar relationships' I would further observe that, if I admitted that the word 'all' in verse 38 is to be restricted to the righteous, then, of course, I do not found the common relationship on anything in this conference with the Sadducees, but it finds an adequate foudation in other passages." Now as Bro. G. also says in said letter that "it is to be doubted whether the word 'all' (Luke 20: 38) includes the wicked," and as he says in the Reply before us (sec. "8") that he is "not confident" "that our Lord's words to the Sadducees, 'all live unto him' may be considered as applying to the dead in general," it follows that *he doubts* whether the words "I am the God of Abraham," &c., express *more* than the "*peculiar* relationship." Let us rejoice at this evidence of progress in the right direction; the symptoms are decidedly hopeful.

6. I propose now to show that in this "Reply No. 2" of Bro. G., he has virtually admitted that the "*peculiar* relationship" *alone* is referred to in Luke 20: 37. If this can be clearly made to appear, we shall not want Bro. G. to progress further on this particular point. From sec. "11" of the Reply I quote the following concession:—"The words Abraham, &c., indeed prove *only* the resurrection of *the righteous*, but this is no proof of the non-resurrection of the wicked, or that the words 'all live unto him' do not include the wicked whose resurrection *other* passages may clearly demonstrate." (The emphasizing is mine.) Upon this sentence (which "I am glad to notice" because it is an "important approximation to" an *important* "truth,") I remark first, that "the words Abraham, &c.," of themselves (or "*abstractly* considered") "prove" *nothing at all.* But if Bro. G. refers (as he certainly does if his words mean anything) to *the relationship* expressed by the declaration "I am the God of Abraham," &c., I would remark that *it* proves the *re-living* of *all* who are intended by the words "*the dead*" in Luke 20: 37; hence, if Bro. G. is correct in asserting, as he now does, that "the words" (which express the *relationship*) "prove only the resurrection of the righteous," it follows most conclusively that the words "*the dead*" in verse 37th, embrace *only* the deceased *righteous*, as maintained in my paraphrase—not "the dead *in general*," as asserted in Bro. G.'s first Reply. Surely, my respondent has at length come out right on this point, and what surprises me is the fact that his concessions, in the language we are considering, are not qualified by any expression of *doubt*. He seems explicitly to give up Luke 20: 37, and then to take refuge in the words "all live unto him." But even these words, as we have seen, he does not feel wholly warranted in so construing as to include "the wicked"! His last resort must, therefore, be to "other passages;" what help *they* offer him will be seen by the discussion between him and the Editor of the EXAMINER. In this connection it may be proper to state that Bro. G., in his letter to me, says of Luke 20: 37 just what he does of the "ALL" of verse 38th, *viz.*, that it "may, as (I) suppose refer to the righteous *only*."

7. In reply to the consideration which Bro. G. thinks *may* prove that the word "ALL" in Luke 20: 38 embraces the wicked dead, I would observe that the declaration, "all live unto him," is based entirely on the fact that those to whom it related are *temporarily* dead. Now before Bro. G. can prove from John 5: 29, that the *wicked* dead "live unto" God, he must prove that the words "resurrection of condemnation" involve being "made *alive*."

8. Bro. G. thinks he could consistently admit that the "all" of Luke 20: 38, embraces only the righteous dead, and still hold to the revival of the wicked. I am of the contrary opinion, and my reason, briefly, is this. The phrase "all live unto him," is *illiptical;* to supply the illipsis we must read "the living," after the word "all." But what is the sense of the words "*the living*" in verse 38th? Evidently this—*the* TEMPORARILY *dead*, for they are the antithesis of "the dead," *viz: the* ETERNALLY *dead*, in the same sense. Now if Bro. Grew admits that "*all*" the *temporarily* dead are the *righteous* dead, he impliedly admits that the *wicked* dead are *eternally* dead, and thus harmonizes with my paraphrase. In this connection I will add, that *I* can see no relevancy in the remarks by which, in sec. "11," Bro. G. attempts to meet the inquiry which he quotes from my former response.

9. On the Greek phrase "*ek neckron*," I remark that the "Dictionary" named by Bro. G. no more authorizes the rendering "out of, or from among dead ones" in Luke 20: 35, than in any other of the many texts which contain the phrase. I am well satisfied that the words never in the New Testament imply "*leaving* some dead."

10. In rely to Bro. G.'s sec. "3," I would observe that there are in the Bible many *proof* texts which still are not given to us in the form of *arguments*. I had no thought of intimating that there were not many passages which Bro. G. supposes teaches the re-living of the wicked dead, but

I presumed our Lord's discourse to the Sadducees would be regarded by him as the "*only direct* ARGUMENT," in the Bible, which conceded that doctrine.

11. The latter part of this Response is written in much haste. I have no time *now* to notice other passages which Bro. G. presses upon my attention; but I may do so hereafter.

MACKNGHT, JR.

The Resurrection.

Br. Storrs.—I trust that a brief review of a few *new* arguments presented in your articles on 1 Cor. 15th chap. will not be deemed inadmissible.

Although you consider "that the apostle was not speaking of a '*general* resurrection' at all," you add, "whatever may be the fact in relation to such a resurrection." This appears to concede that this chapter, which treats exclusively of the resurrection of the saints, does not disprove a '*general* resurrection.' Yet on the 43d verse you remark, "Surely this belongs alone to those in Christ; but it is the dead without limitation," &c. How can this be? You have just before written that "none but those '*in* Christ' are embraced." This is surely a 'limitation,' for you will not say, with the Universalist, that *all* the dead are *in* Christ. That "the peculiarity of the revival from tho dead," *which the apostle here treats of*, i. e., to "GLORY," is "manifestly a gospel benefit," is very true, but this is no proof that there is no "resurrection to condemnation," (John 5: 29,) which is *not* such a benefit.

So also the fact, that none but the saints, who are to be raised "incorruptible and immortal," "came within the apostle's view in the re-living of the dead ones" *in this chapter*, is surely no evidence, that none others came within his view when he testified to a "resurrection both of the just and the unjust," Acts 24: 15, or in Christ's view, John 5: 29.

The words "neither doth corruption inherit incorruption," applies to the corruptible bodies of the saints. It proves nothing as to the question at issue.

My dear brother thinks he can adduce an argument in his favor from the fact that, in respect to the saints of the first resurrection, Death will be swallowed up in victory, and that this will be "the time of death's complete overthrow." Let us see if this is the *terminus* of death. The saints rise to "live and reign with Christ a thousand years," Rev. 20: 4. "The nations" in the flesh over which they will have "power," Rev. 2: 26, Dan. 7: 27, will be subject to *death*. See also Isa. 65: 20. *After* the thousand years, the multitude who go up to assail the beloved city, will be devoured by *death*. The *terminus* of death will be in the lake of fire, which will be "the second death" to the resurrected wicked, as Rev. 20: 12-15 appears to me clearly to prove. THEN "the wicked dead are eternally shut out from view, and from life" and not, brother, at the period of the first resurrection, as you represent.

Fraternally yours,

Phila. June 18th, 1856. HENRY GREW.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—The reader will please look at our article on 1 Corth. 15, again; and our previous remarks on Acts 24: 15, vol. 10, page 302; and on John 5: 29, vol. 10, page 296, 328; see also remarks on this text vol. 10, page 364, and present vol. page 10. Until it is proved that any who *die* AFTER the saints are made alive from the dead, are to *live again*, Br. G.'s reference to such is of no weight against our remarks on 1 Corth. 15th; for when we said, "the dead—without limitation," we added, "*i. e.*, all who are to have a *revival into life*." If Br. G. had quoted this explanation of ours instead of breaking us off with "&c." he would saved us the trouble of any reply.

REMARKS ON JOHN 5: 29.

BY JACOB GRIM.

We give place to the following remarks by Br. GRIM because he was the original "MACKNIGHT" who had a discussion with VERITAS—which latter was Br. GREW—on the revival of the wicked dead. In the late discussion Br. Grim has been a looker on, while Br. Grew has written fully on the question. We think, therefore, it is Br. Grim's privilege to make a statement of his views on the above text.—ED. EXR.

Br. Storrs.—Much has been said of John 5: 29, touching the resurrection of the *dead;* meaning that all will rise without distinction of character.

Now, I feel disposed to give my reasons for not believing it teaches the doctrine ascribed to it. I have seen no reason, "as yet," to alter the opinion that I hold, and would have said something on this passage long before, but, I was anxious to see all that could be brought in favor of the resurrection of the wicked; and now it seems clearly established to my mind that, if they had not John 5: 29 to fly to they would sink without any Hope, as they call it.

First then: Jesus came not to offer salvation to *all* men. "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"; Math. 15: 24; Math. 10: 6. This language of Jesus was used to the Jews only; and, if the word *all* was used in its broadest sense could only refer to the Jewish family, that was under the old covenant. You ask me, what this has to do with the subject? I "answer," the Gentiles were, at the time Jesus used the expression, without any *hope* of life, in any sense whatever; they had no covenant of works, or promise; and it was not until the Jews had counted themselves unworthy af Eternal Life, that the offer of salvation was made to the Gentiles. But, I, do not think this is the subject under discussion with Jesus: *viz.*, (the resurrection;) the subject was that in the 18th verse, *viz.*, Jesus' claiming to be the Son of God, and, in proof of his being the Son of God, he says, that the Father raiseth the *dead*, and vivifieth them; so also the

Son, vivifieth whom he pleaseth. Now, if all the dead were to be raised, independent of Jesus Christ, I can see no force in this language of Jesus, as claiming by it the right to be called the Son of God. But he does claim, that the Father had committed to him, the power of judging who was worthy to receive this resurrection; that, through the miracles he wrought upon those whom he judged worthy, they, the Jews, might see his power and honor him as they honored the Father. This is the very thing the Jews denied. "He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not him that sent him." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath life eternal; and will not come into CONDEMNATION *but hath passed from* DEATH *unto life.*" Now it is very evident they had not passed the death that this mortal body is the subject of; but they had passed that which is the subject of the discourse, *viz.*, the condemnation which is in opposition to eternal life. "He that believeth on the Son, hath life eternal; but he that obeyeth not the Son, shall not see *life*, but the wrath of God, will abide on him." John 3: 36, and John 5: 24 perfectly agree. Now persons may talk of torments, second death, and a host of other things, as being the wrath of God, but Jesus, explains himself when he says, they that obey him have passed from death unto life. The Father so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son; that men might not perish. If there had not been a symbol in the book of Revelation, called the second death, our friends would never thought of the term; it is not found in the Old or New Testament till we come to that book.

"He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath eternal life." Now, in this verse, eternal life is predicated upon believing the word or doctrine of Jesus, and that doctrine was, "that he was the Son of God": the thing in dispute with the Jews. Believing him to be such, gave them the title to eternal life in the sense that they would not come under condemnation. There is another sense in which this condemnation may be taken, the Jews were to receive a Prophet like unto Moses. If they would hear him, it would be well with them; but if they would not hear him they should be destroyed from among the people. This will come under our next head. 25th verse, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the time cometh, or rather is come, when the *dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and HEARING they shall LIVE." Who shall hear, and, why shall they live? are questions to be answered. They that have "passed from death unto life" shall hear, and they shall live, is the answer in the 24th verse. "For," or because, "as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son also to have life in himself." John 20: 31, "But these things are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God; and that WHEN ye believe, ye may have life eternal by his name." If there is any other name by which men may have *life* we would like to know it; and, if there is any other *life* than that which Jesus speak of, as his receiving from the Father, beyond this present, we would like to know something about it. Men may talk about animal and temporal life, and, corruptible life in the future, but, we want a "thus saith the Lord" as plain as John 3: 36—"He that believeth on the Son hath life eternal; but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." Yes, say our brethren, that means "life eternal." We know it does; and, for that very reason we want you to show us where Jesus or any of his disciples offered any man life temporal, in the future. Jesus saith that he "quickeneth whom he will"; and he tells us, whom he will quicken, *viz.*, those that hear his voice. Yes, say our friends, "and he says in the 29th verse, all shall hear his voice." If this be so, then, all are "quickened," and all LIVE; and as Jesus speaks of but *one life*—and gives the cause of this life—For, or because, as I received this life from my Father; and as all hear my voice, all live by this LIFE. Here is an immortal, incorruptible life imparted unto all men—according to our brethren's theory on John 5: 29—and universal salvation is TRUE. Stop, says one Br., "they come forth to condemnation."—Then they come forth to eternal life of condemnation; for the only life that Jesus has to impart is that which he received from his Father; and they are raised to condemnation; and Luke says, they cannot *die* any more. It follows, that they must live and be eternally condemned.

Now I understand that the subject of discussion closed at the 26th verse; and the 27th verse introduces a new fact, *viz.*, "and hath given him even judicial authority," (why?) "because he is the SON of MAN," (Campbell) "and hath, moreover, given him authority to execute judgment, as he is also the Son of Man;" (Murdock.) "This," says Murdock, "is the true rendering, as the other scarcely makes intelligible sense."

"*Wonder not at this*"—at what? I told you, that I was the Son of God, and proved it by my works; and if ye had read Moses and believed his sayings, ye would have believed on me, for he wrote of me; and all these miracles caused no wonderment; only led you on to try to kill me; but now I assert another fact, that I am the Son of Man; the title you are willing to give me; and as I am the Son of Man, the Father hath committed to my hands the judgment of your nation; wonder not at this, "that I am the Son of Man,—for the time cometh when all that are in their graves shall hear HIS voice, and come forth; they that have done good shall arise to enjoy life, and they that have done evil shall arise to suffer punishment."—(Campbell.) "*Whose voice are they to hear*"? "the Son of God's"? "no": the dead that have obeyed hear his voice; but in this case, they that are in their graves hear the voice, ONLY of THE SON of MAN, and all come forth.—Not one word is said in this verse of the *dead*, hearing the voice: it is only those that are in graves. Not one word is said about the dead being made *alive* by his voice; but there is a sense in which the Jewish people were in their graves, both good and bad; and when the Son of Man executed the Judgment upon that people they did hear and awake; they that had done good escaped all the judgments "written," for they took the warning voice and escaped; but the others

suffered the condemnation written against that people. For the symbol of graves, look at Ezekiel 37, speaking of the Jewish people, "I will open your graves and bring you forth, the whole house of Israel."

That this is the meaning of this passage of Scripture, I have not the least doubt. I would like some one to attempt to harmonize it, and, Luke 20, with the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked after a revival into life from the dead. I for my part have been satisfied that either no revival into life, out of Christ, or eternal torments is the doctrine of the Bible.

Yours, in hope of life only through Christ,

JACOB GRIM.

CHURCH OFFICERS.

The following article from H. GREW was received last April. We did not publish it at the time because we deemed it premature, and that it would be unjust to Dr. M'CULLOH to forestall his argument which was not completed; and especially as the texts relied on by Br. Grew were taken up by Dr. M'Culloh in his argument at that time unpublished—particularly the Epistle to Titus; now, as we have given that part of his argument, we give Br. Grew's criticisms; and the reader will do well to look at Dr. M'Culloh's remarks generally, on the subject, while he reads the strictures; particularly should he compare his remarks on the Epistle to Titus with them. See EXAMINER of June 15th, pages 180—184. We have not yet quite finished the article of Dr. M'Culloh; and what we have given has been to a disadvantage, by too long intermissions between the extracts; but we could not well avoid this. We hope however every one who can will furnish himself with the entire set of his work from which we have taken the extracts. A greater amount of information can hardly be found for the cost: *viz:* $2.50 for two octavo volumes of 500 pages each; sent to purchaser free of expense; or $2 sent at his expense.

PHILADELPHIA, *April* 15th, 1856.

Br. Storrs.—The article of our intelligent Bro. McCulloh on the subject 'of the officers or institutions observed in the (first) Christian churches," appears to me to exemplify the trite truth that we are "prone to extremes." The fact that Jesus Christ has appointed no such "lords over God's heritage" as popes, councils, synods or *modern* bishops, is no proof against the belief that "the church stands upon the foundation of a divinely appointed constitution," &c., both in respect to its "officers (and) institutions."

Our brother is disposed to consider these "officers or institutions," to "be only the result of expediences adopted by pious persons as the best mode they could select for the edification of their disciples." The adoption of this principle appears to me to be the very door by which those errors entered, which have "corrupted" the Christian church "from the simplicity which is in Jesus Christ." On this very ground of assumed authority to appoint "officers (and) institutions," deemed by human wisdom to be expedient, the pope himself, and his successors, in the usurpation of the rights and privileges of the disciples of Jesus Christ, have vindicated their tyrannical domination.

If the means which are necessary for the sanctification of the redeemed and for the conversion of sinners to God, are left to the fallible decision of human expediency, we need not wonder at the divisions and sub-divisions of professing Christians. It is only by the general adoption of the truth, by the Christian church, that these means are "the commandments and ordinances *of the Lord*," that their holy union, which our Saviour has prayed for, and connected with the conversion of the world, can be accomplished. John 17.

Our esteemed friend is certainly correct in teaching us that "ordained bishops or presbyters" are not "a class of men divinely constituted for the *exclusive* office of instructing the people in their religious obligations"; this however is no proof that the office was not of divine appointment.—The command to Christian brethren to exhort one another when assembled for the worship of God, is perfectly consistent with the *divine* command to "ordain elders in every city." Titus 1: 5–7. I say *divine* command, for Paul requires every spiritual person to "acknowledge that the things (he wrote) are the commandments of the Lord."—1 Cor. 14: 37.

It is important for us to understand, that the ordinances of the New Testament churches, rest on a far more excellent basis than that of human expediency. The proof of this is found in the commission of the Saviour to his apostles, to teach his disciples all things whatsoever he had commanded them,—Matt. 28: 20, and in the truthful apostolic declaration, "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you."—1 Cor. 11: 23. The approved practices, therefore, of the first churches, are not of human device; they are clearly traceable to the divine directions of the Son of the Blessed, who spoke to his apostles as the Father gave him commandment.—John 12: 50. His own words of warning demand our solemn consideration. "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men."—Matt. 15: 9. Alas! my brethren, how has human expediency, (the wisdom which is foolishness with God,) made void his holy commandments!

In proof that the "officers or institutions observed in the Christian churches of his (Paul's) days," are "divinely appointed," and not the mere "result of expediences adopted by pious (fallible) persons," I offer the following testimonies of the Holy Spirit.

Eph. 4: 10–12.—"He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things. And he gave some, apostles; and some prophets; and some evange-

lists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the word of ministry; for the edifying of the body of Christ." Titus 1: 5–7. "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." Acts 14: 23.—"And when they (the apostles Paul and Barnabas, v. 14,) had ordained them elders in every church," &c. Acts 20: 28. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, (elders of the churches at Ephesus) and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost (not fallible men merely) hath made your overseers, (bishops) to feed the church of the Lord which he hath purchased with his own blood." See also 1 Peter 5: 1–3. 1 Tim. 3d chap. Heb. 13: 17. 1 Tim. 5: 17, 18. Gal. 1: 1. As the office is of divine appointment we find the requisite qualifications for it declared by the Holy Spirit.

Titus 1: 5–7 proves that the terms elder and bishop are descriptive of the very same office, also the propriety of a plurality of "elders" in one church. See also Acts 15: 4, 20: 17, 14: 23.—There is not a single precept or example authorizing the ordination of a bishop over a plurality of churches. They are not to be "lords over God's heritage," but "ensamples to the flock" and to feed them with the word of truth, as the "servants" of the church "for Jesus' sake."—2 Cor. 4: 5. Nor are the duties of teaching, and exhorting and praying, confined to them as 1 Cor. 14th chap., Heb. 10: 25, and other passages clearly prove.

Our brother's objections may now be considered.

He observes, "Paul says nothing about such persons having a divine commission" in his letters to the Thessalonians. I remark,—1. As Paul recognizes the elders in that church as those who were over them "IN THE LORD," the authority of the Lord is implied. 2. If this is inadmissible, as Paul taught the same things in every church, 1 Cor. 4: 17, and that by "the commandment of the Lord," 1 Cor. 14: 37, we may conclude that when he preached the gospel to them and taught them their duties as a Christian church, he claimed divine authority for the ordination of elders among them: Acts 17 chap. It was unnecessary for him to repeat this specifically, when he subsequently wrote to them. 3. Even supposing that on no occasion the apostle specifically stated to the church that these officers were appointed by "a divine commission," Eph. 4: 10–12, already quoted, and Acts 20: 28, establish this fact.

It is remarked "that the apostles could not have been regarded by the Christian brethren as a divine corporation established by Christ to legislate for the church." This is very true. Christ himself, under his Father, is the only Legislator of the Christian church. The work of the apostles, and elders, is not to *make* laws, but to teach the observance of the laws made by Christ. The fact that they are not divinely commissioned to *legislate* is no proof that they are not divinely commissioned for some other purpose.

The 12th and 14th chapters of the first epistle to the Corinthians, are referred to by our brother who affirms, "not a single word does he (Paul) say concerning bishops, presbyters or deacons," &c. I find both referred to in the passage he has quoted under the terms "teachers" and "helps." However, if he had made no reference at all to them, it would no more have disproved the existence of such officers and their divine commission, than James' omission to declare the doctrine of the resurrection disproves that important and glorious truth.

The correct remark, that, in some passages, the word *prophet* merely signifies a religious or *moral teacher* or *exhorter*, "constitutes no objection to the fact that elders or bishops were ordained by divine appointment "in every city."—Titus 1: 5–7. Nor does the general exhortation to the church officers and others not to "be puffed up," &c., present any objection. Humility becomes the Christian in whatever station he may occupy.

"The epistle to the Romans" is also referred to, and chapter 13: 1–7; where obedience is required "to the heathen magistry"; in which it is remarked, the apostle "takes no notice whatever of any church officers, or any revenue to which they were entitled." I cannot but consider this mode of reasoning unworthy of the intelligent writer. Having found a general command of divine authority to "ordain elders in EVERY city"—"in EVERY church," Titus 1: 5–7, Acts 20: 28, we are bound to make no exception, unless such exception is explicitly stated. There is no such exception adduced by our brother in respect to this church or any other, nor *can* any such exception be adduced. The omission of the apostle to mention the subject in this epistle, no more disproves the existence of elders, or their divine appointment, or that they were not to be "highly esteemed for their works' sake," than his omission to mention the subject of the Lord's supper proves that they did not observe that sacred institution.

When the disciples of Jesus Christ shall abandon the traditions of their own imaginary expediency, and return to the simplicity of their Master's commandments, then will his prayer for their holy union be fulfilled, to his honor and our sacred joy; then shall his church, which he has redeemed with his own blood, shine forth, "beautiful as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem, and terrible (to her foes) as an army with banners."

HENRY GREW.

Sight and Faith—Or, Earth and Heaven.

"Cenceive,' says Dr. Chalmers, "a man to be standing on the margin of this green world; and that, when he looked towards it, he saw abundance smiling upon every field, and all the blessings which earth can afford scattered in profusion throughout every family, and the light of the sun sweetly resting upon all the pleasant habitations, and the joys of human companionship brightening many a happy circle of society; conceive this to be the general character of the scene upon one side of his contemplation, and then on the other, beyond the verge of the goodly planet on which he was situated, he could descry nothing but a dark and fathomless un-

known. Think you that he would bid a voluntary adieu to all the brightness and all the beauty that were before him upon the earth, and commit himself to the frightful solitude away from it? Would he leave its peopled dwelling-places, and become a solitary wanderer through the fields of nonentity? If space afford him nothing but a wilderness, would he for it abandon the homebred scenes of life and of cheerfulness that lay so near, and exerted such a power of urgency to detain him? Would he not cling to the regions of sense, and of life, and of society? and, shrinking away from the desolation that was beyond it, would not he be glad to keep his firm footing on the territory of this world, and to take shelter under the silver canopy stretched over it?

"But if, during the time of his contemplation, some happy island of the blest had floated by, and there had burst upon his senses the light of its surpassing glories and its sounds of sweeter melody, and he clearly saw that thus a purer beauty rested upon every field, and a more heartfelt joy spread itself among all the families, and he could discern there a peace, and a piety, and a benevolence, which put a moral gladness into every bosom, and united the whole society in one rejoicing sympathy with each other, and with the beneficent Father of them all;—could he further see that pain and mortality were there unknown, and above all that signals of welcome were hung out, and an avenue of communication was made for him —perceive you not that what was before the wilderness would become the land of invitation, and that now the world would be the wilderness? What unpeopled space could not do, can be done by space teeming with beatific scenes and beatific society. And let the existing tendencies of the heart be what they may to the scenes that are near and visible around us, still if another stood revealed to the prospect of man, either through the channel of faith or through the channel of his senses, then, without violence done to the constitution of his moral nature, may he die unto the present world, and live to the loveliest world that stands in the distance away from it!"

"MAN'S DESTINY.—Immortality: Arguments from Nature and Scripture. By Rev. T. M. POST, D.D., St. Louis, Mo.; *Reviewed* by GEO. STORRS, Editor of *Bible Examiner*."

This work has been sent to all our subscribers who have paid for the last half of the present volume of the BIBLE EXAMINER. If any such have not received it they will please inform us.

The foregoing work is now ready for sale in any quantity that may be desired. *Price* 38 cents per copy; or three copies for $1. In either case we will send free of postage. Five copies will be sent for $1 if the purchaser takes the postage on himself. The Pamphlet is not sent out as the "BIBLE EXAMINER" except to actual subscribers; and it is without that head to others, having the same matter on the cover as on the *Title Page*.—To subscribers the postage is the same, and no more, as four of the regular numbers of the EXAMINER: that is as the matter is decided at this Post Office.

We have had a portion of the work bound and lettered: Price, bound, 50 cents. Two copies will be sent free of postage for $1.

WE have given nearly all our space to others in this number, and will do the best we can for the same in the next. We are glad to have a little chance to rest awhile. During the intervals of the issue of numbers 18, 19, and 20 we may spend fifteen days in Lecturing abroad. We have had invitations from Ontario County, and also from Massachusetts. If the time between the middle of August and the middle of October will be agreeable to those who have invited us, we will endeavor to arrange to be with them.

THE OFFICE OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER is at our *Residence*, 62 *Hicks Street*, Brooklyn; a short distance from *Fulton Ferry*: but in all cases *address* us as follows:

GEO. STORRS,
Box **4658**,
New York.

Usually we can be found at home at all hours except between 9 and 11 o'clock in the morning. We have *an Agency* at 109 *Nassau Street*, *New York*, in the Book Store of *Fairchild & Co.*, where our works can be had *at retail*, and where orders may be left for us, as we shall call there daily between the hours indicated above. City subscribers who call for their papers will find them there.

"SIX SERMONS," *Revised and Enlarged.*—Those who have read this work, have found very much matter not in the *Original:* besides an entire new sermon on "*Christ the Life-Giver.*" In addition to this, it is printed with a large clear type, thus affording much more satisfaction in reading. *Price*, in plain binding, 63 cents; in gilt, $1. We will put eight copies, plain-binding, for $3, cash.

"THE GOSPEL HOPE" is the only *Tract* we have on hand. Our friends will oblige us to state definitely what works they want when they send; and be sure not ask us for those we have not.—See our Catalogue in "MAN'S DESTINY."

WILL THE WICKED DEAD BE MADE ALIVE?—This question has called out many expressions of opinion among our subscribers, as the discussion has gone on. A Correspondent in the EXAMINER of June 15th, expresses the opinion that "three-fourths of the brethren will not adopt" the negative of the question. Supposing that to be true, it is no reason for not discussing it. From the communications we have received, we think our Correspondent is mistaken in the number who are on the negative side. If we can judge from what we hear, the largest portion of our subscribers have embraced the negative; and numbers of them, too, who at first were with the affirmative. Not a few have written us decidedly on this point whom we had supposed were confirmed in the affirmative, from what we had previously known of them. We have wished to avoid every thing that should have the appearance of exultation in this matter. This will explain to several who have written us why their communications have not appeared in the EXAMINER. An aged brother, in Arkansas, who has spent his life in studying the Scriptures, in a most independent manner says:

"From the very beginning of this controversy—which at the first was truly a subject unthought of by some of us—I have noticed with no little solicitude the different phases of the whole argument" * * * "and to the best of my judgment, the advantage, or simple truth, is all on your side. You have fully sustained the negative" He adds, "I most cheerfully forbear offering any other comment, with this single corrobrative Scripture to *your*, and *our* side of the question, *viz.*: 'They who *shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection*, neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can *they die any more*, but are equal to the angels; and are the sons of God, *being the sons of the resurrection.*"

This is only a sample of the approval we have received. The dissentents, so far as they have written us, are few; and fewer still who have expressed themselves decided on the affirmative.—Some who have talked most against us, behind our back, have never spoken to us on the subject, though they have often seen us; nor have they ever offered us a line in defence of their side, and have said—we are told—that they would would not discuss a subject with an Editor in his own paper. One of this class claims to be an *Editor*. Of course, his paper can have but *one side—i. e.* it must be sectarian and popish in the fullest sense. If he wishes to try his hand in this question our columns are open for him, and we will use only as many pages in reply as he does in his argument.

We are informed that he has employed the following grand argument against us—not in print of course, and probably he did not expect we should hear of it. It runs thus—

The EDITOR of the EXAMINER has spent "weeks and months, and hundreds of dollars in proving that" the "death" of the wicked "is only 'an eternal sleep'—and by consequence all that a sinner has to do to escape the presence and wrath of Christ at the judgment is just to take *strychninė* or *arsenic* when they see the Lord *appear*, and hence there will be no need of calling for rocks and mountains to fall upon them and hide them, as a pistol bullet would do it with equal ease."

"How forcible are right words." Let it be remembered the person who utters the foregoing believes the wicked dead will be made alive *mortally*, and will die again. If his words are of any force they are as much against himself as against us.—If the Lord is determined to keep the wicked alive for a given time, at all events, neither "strychnine, arsenic" nor a "pistol bullet"—during that time—could deprive them of life. If God has not determined to keep them alive for a given time without respect to the laws of *mortality*—then supposing all the wicked dead are made alive, may they not take "strychnine, arsenic, a pistol bullet," or any other means to deprive a *mortal* being of life, just as effectually then as now? Will our philosopher tell us what is the mighty difference between a mortal wicked man now and after his revival from the dead? Why cannot he kill himself then, as easily as now? If God has determined he shall not kill himself then, so he can determined he shall not kill himself when he" sees the Lord appear." Our philosopher must try again.

DEATH.

Death is not burning
Forever, in life;
Death is not living
In unending strife.

'Tis after rejecting
The *Life Giver's* plan,
He thoroughly purgeth
The floor with his fan.

Yes, when the wheat gathering,
He giveth the hire;
'Tis burning the chaff with
Unquenchable fire.

'Tis as if they never
Were born drawing breath;
Not being forever—
Amen—that is Death.

S. BATCHELOR.

he has employed the fol-
against us—not in print
he did not expect we
is thus—

AMINER has spent "weeks
ds of dollars in proving
he wicked "is only 'an
onsequence all that a sin-
he presence and wrath of
just to take *strychninė*
e the Lord *appear*, and
d of calling for rocks and
hem and hide them, as a
with equal ease."

it words." Let it be re-
utters the foregoing be-
l be made alive *mortally*,
s words are of any force
himself as against us.—
to keep the wicked alive
ents, neither "strychnine,
let"—during that time—
. If God has not deter-
e for a given time with-
f *mortality*—then sup-
ead are made alive, may
e, arsenic, a pistol bullet,"
prive a *mortal* being of
hen as now? Will our
is the mighty difference
l man now and after his
Why cannot he kill him-
w? If God has deter-
mself then, so he can de-
himself when he" sees the
osopher must try again.

TH.:
rning
ife;
ing
strife.
ing
er's plan,
purgeth
h his fan.
wheat gathering,
e hire;
e chaff with
le fire.
never
lrawing breath;
ever—
is Death.

S. BATCHELOR.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, AUGUST, 1856. NO. 18.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year;

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive?

FOURTH REJOINDER OF H. H. HALL.

Dear Bro. Storrs:—I do not know as I ought to trouble you again, and I feel a delicacy in doing so after reading your last response, especially the closing paragraph. I have however decided to reply to a few points, and thus bring the discussion, so far as I am concerned, to a close. I do so because you have intimated very plainly that it is not agreeable to you to have it protracted further on my part.

I am very sorry that I have overstepped the mark so far that my brother deems the discussion unprofitable on account of its going over "much of the ground of Bro. Grew," and consequently "*compelled*" some "repetition," and has not therefore "been so much prized by the readers who had the EXAMINER last year, and more difficult to understand by those who had it not."

I should not have been led into what my brother *now* deems objectionable, had it not been for his very kind invitation in language as follows.—"If, however, they" (another brother and myself) "wish after Bro. Grew is through, to go over any part of the ground again they shall have place in our columns." I trust *this*, with the fact that Bro. G. had closed his discussion with "Respondent," will be deemed a sufficient apology for my having so far trespassed upon the columns, and what *may be* the true interest of the EXAMINER. I was not aware however that I *had* gone over *much* of the same ground of Bro. G., not having *referred* to a single article of his since our friendly discussion commenced. And it would be very difficult to "elicit all the light that can be had on the subject" that my brother desired at the start, or, the *little* that I have been able to shed, without referring to, and noticing some of the passages presented by Bro. G. But letting this all pass, I proceed.

(1.) If my brother is content to let pass without notice, my last argument on 1 Cor. 15: 22, in regard to the *two classes* of passages wherein the expression "*in* Christ" occurs, showing as I conceive, such a difference of construction as to settle forever the point that "*in* Christ," &c., verse 22, means *through* Christ shall *all* be made alive"—I am of course willing to submit it to the candid consideration of the reader, requesting him however to refer to my argument which will be found on page 162 of No. 10. I also wish to refer to the following remark of my brother—he says, "our brother mistakes our meaning if he supposes we acknowledge the changing of *in* to *by* is not critically wrong in verse 22. If our language would bear that construction, it certainly was not the sense we intended to convey." His language will not only "bear that construction," but I cannot see that it will bear *any other* construction. But he now says, "We believe it is 'critically wrong' to translate it *by*," i. e., "unless *positive testimony* of the living again of the wicked dead can be found in other portions of inspiration," which as yet he thinks has not been done; but if it *should* be done, *then* according to his *language* as quoted above, the change would be critically right.

(2.) I here wish, by the way, to refer to a peculiar way my brother has had during the discussion of this subject, of disposing of what *we* and what *he* formally deemed to be positive testimony in favor of the resurrection of the wicked. It is this—when a text, however positive in its character, has been presented, he has labored (honestly I have no doubt) to render it of doubtful import, and then as a consequence has required his opponent to present some other positive proof text, if one he had, that could not by any process of argumentation be stripped of its plain positive meaning. He must do *this* or fail in sustaining his view. If John 5: 28, 29, is quoted as positive proof of the resurrection of the wicked dead, my brother admits that the wicked will have a resurrection of some kind, but it cannot be, they are made *alive*, for the *word* LIFE does not there occur in reference to *them*. In what "*sense*" they are to have a resurrection we have not yet been informed; but I conclude, as *resurrection* means to be raised up again, (and I do believe *life* is certainly *implied* in a resurrection) that my brother *supposes* that the *skeletons* or *corpses* of the wicked will be raised up,—and this must be at the *voice* and by the power of the Son of God—but having no *life*, HOW can they *hear his voice?* and yet they *must* and *will* HEAR, though they have no *life* or consciousness, as my brother believes, for, Jesus Christ says, "For the hour is coming, in the which ALL that are in the graves shall HEAR his voice and come forth" [how *can* they "*come forth*" if they have no life?] "they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life" [eternal] "and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation," [and death eternal.] For *what*, I sincerely ask, are these *lifeless* corpses to be brought

or rather to "*come forth*"? Is it to be judged? or to have judgment executed upon them? Nay. My brother believes they were *judged* previous to this, and that judgment was *executed* upon them when they died. For *what* then, I ask again, are they to "*come forth*" from their graves,—and by what power are they sustained,—and where do they go to after their resurrection?—these and many other questions that might be put, must be fairly answered before there is even a show of doing away the force and positiveness of this passage as proof text on our side of the question. To my mind such a resurrection of corpses without life and consciousness (and those very corpses *hearing* the voice of the Son of God) is not only absurd but ridiculous. In regard to the language, "all that are in the graves shall *hear his voice*"—it may be said that even the saints as they lie destitute of life and consciousness cannot literally *hear* the voice of Christ, and if these cannot, then it is not likely our Lord intended to teach that the wicked dead should literally *hear* his voice. In reply to such an argument I have only to say, that I believe they will in both cases literally hear the voice of the Son of God as the sleeping man hears the voice of another that loudly calls him from his sleep. The very first tone from the powerful voice of Jesus will awaken the sleeping nations, and although they may not distinctly hear its first accents, yet starting in an instant to life and consciousness, that deep toned voice is heard before its cadences have passed away. But I understand if they do *not* hear the first sound of the trumpet, with which they *may* be awakened before Christ speaks and calls them forth, they *will hear* the second blast and the voice of the archangel. As persons who sleep do not always hear the first call, so the many "that sleep in the dust of the earth" may not hear the first call, but they will most certainly hear the voice of the Son of God and "awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt." I believe this, and cannot believe otherwise, because Christ himself has unequivocally declared that "ALL *shall hear his voice and come forth.*"

(3.) But to return—my brother said that on my theory "Christ is manifested to be the greatest curse to the wicked." I replied—Christ was manifested to be a blessing to all who comply with the terms of the gospel, but not in *any sense* to those who wickedly reject his mercy, &c. My brother replies—"We think Christ is a blessing to all men in *some sense.*" He *may* be in the sense of *respite* from punishment, thus giving the sinner an opportunity of obtaining eternal life, but should he finally reject Christ, his golden opportunities would not be a blessing in the end.

But you continue:—"He saith this greatest curse 'does not come upon the sinner in consequence of the resurrection of Christ, but because of their *rejection* of Christ.' Now, the largest portion of sinners never heard of Christ, and consequently never personally rejected him. Hence if *such* are to be raised to life, by Christ's resurrection—as Bro. H. maintains—and never would have been made alive but for Christ—and if that life is only to be tormented and killed again—we ask, if Christ is not the greatest curse to all such that can be imagined."

The economy of the gospel is, according to Paul, that it proves "a savor of *life* unto *life*," and therefore a blessing unto those who believe; but "a savor of *death* unto *death*," and therefore a "*curse*" unto those that reject the gospel.—This leaves my brother at issue with the great apostle. The truth is, wicked men *must* and *ought* to be punished more for rejecting the glorious blazing light of the gospel, than those who were not under the gospel or who never heard the gospel; but if the wicked are never raised up to life, the most incorrigible blasphemer and murderer receives no greater punishment than the comparatively innocent child that merely neglected salvation. *I* can see no justice in this; perhaps my brother can.

(4.) But you add:—"'They *might* and *ought* to have avoided the terrible punishment denounced against them in the Scriptures of truth,' saith our brother." And you reply, "The vast majority of sinners never heard of the Scriptures nor their denunciations—they never heard of Christ. Yet according to Br. H. they are '*all* to be made alive *by* Christ'—tormented hopelessly, and burned up in *gehenna's* fire for not *avoiding* that of which they never heard. And all this comes *by* Christ."

My brother has here ascribed a sentiment to me that I have not asserted and do not believe—that the heathen will be "hopelessly tormented," &c. I believe with Paul that they will be judged and punished by the law they *have*, and *not* by the law they have *not*. "For those without law," he says, "who sin, will also perish without law; and those under the law, who sin, will be judged by the law" * * * "in the day in which God will judge the secret [actions] of men." (Rom. 2.—Murdock.) If the reader will read this chapter he will see that the apostle very plainly teaches a difference in the punishment of those who have heard the gospel, and those who have heard it not—that those "*who obey not the truth and are obstinate*," &c., are to be visited with God's *wrath* and are to endure "*tribulation and anguish*," not when they die, but *in the day of judgment.*—Therefore while I do believe that the heathen, who have not lived up to the light they had will be burned up in gehenna's fire, I do not believe they will be "hopelessly tormented for not *avoiding* that of which they never heard." There are pangs connected with "the second death," for gospel hardened sinners which the heathen will never experience. This is rational and just. But on your hypothesis, all have one common punishment, and men are *not* judged and punished according to the deeds done in the body.

But my brother thinks with this view even, that the *resurrection* of Chirst, if these heathen are to be raised also, is the procuring cause of *such* punishment; as, they have never heard of Christ and could not therefore reject him, and if he had not been raised *they* would have had no other punishment for *personal* transgression, according to my admission, than an eternal sleep in the dust of the earth. To this I reply, that *if* Christ's resurrection *is* the *procuring cause*, it is because his re-

surrection is inseparably connected with the gospel plan which was conceived in the infinite Mind, not only before the gospel system was introduced, but before Adam fell. Hence it is absurd in one sense to say, as we frequently do, that *if* Christ had not been manifested, death would have been an eternal sleep to the human race—nay, I might say just as truly that *if* Christ had not been *promised*, the race could not have existed a single day! for Adam was doubtless spared from immediate death on account of the wonderful plan of redemption conceived before Adam was created.—This being the case, no argument founded on these *ifs* is admissible.

(5.) Again you remark:—"Br. H. says, 'the sinner is to be made alive and tormented awhile to satisfy the law of God for *personal* transgression.' Indeed: then the wages of sin is not death but torment, and if the sinner must be made alive and tormented, sometime must elapse for that torment to be accomplished. During that time he will be multiplying his sins; and if God's law is unchangeable it will require an additional period to torment the sinner for the sins he commits while undergoing his first season of torments; and then another, and another, till '*eternal torments*' become inevitable," &c.

I did not say *directly* as you have quoted, that "the sinner is to be made alive and tormented awhile." True, I admitted it indirectly and unintentionally in answering your question—"for what purpose or end is 'the sinner' to be made alive and tormented awhile"? I replied 'to satisfy the law of God for the *personal* transgression of *the sinner* and not for ADAM'S transgression.' My answer was intended to refer to their resurrection and subsequent punishment of the second death, and not to the *torment*. My opinion is that the wicked will have no "*positive* infliction of pain" aside from the pangs connected with the second death, unless the awful stings of conscience which each one will endure according to their sin against light and knowledge, may be considered a *positive* infliction; and this has usually been understood to be the natural result of sin and not a *positive* punishment by God. Hence, this being the case, gospel rejecters, and God blasphemers, and all gospel enlightened and gospel hardened sinners will have consciences that will cry aloud against them for their folly and madness in stifling the convictions of sin and resisting the blessed influence of God's Spirit: and their poignant grief will be redoubled when as they come up on the breadth of the new earth, and encompass the camp of the saints about and the beloved city—that city which John saw come down from God out of heaven to the new earth—they see the beautiful earth "arrayed in living green" and flowers of varied hue, and rivers of delight clear as crystal flowing out from the throne of God and the Lamb, and

> Behold the saints of God with harps of gold,
> Safely delivered and all in the fold.

And they will thus keenly realize what durable riches they have lost—what felicity—what surpassing loveliness and glory their *eyes* must forever be closed upon—what entrancing melody which they *may* be permitted to hear for a little season, as the enraptured host swell out their loud hosannas with harps and voices in praise to God and the Lamb, their ears will be shut against; while the heathen who had not enjoyed gospel privileges would escape those stings of conscience and those *unutterable* horrors of the second death produced by a most lively sense of the tremendous loss attending it, and would only be "*burned up*" or "*devoured*" by the fire that comes down from God out of heaven: and this would not be so horrible and cruel a death as many martyrs have suffered at the hands of the enemies of the cross.—Consequently I cannot think with my brother "that the theory which embraces the living again of all the wicked dead, including Adam—the old world—Sodom and Gomorrah, &c., is a theory unreasonable, inconsistent, unscriptural, horrible, unreconcilable, dishonorable to the character of God, stripping the gospel of its peculiar glory, and making Christ the minister of sin."

Again, even admitting that "the sinner must be made alive and tormented awhile," it does not follow, as my brother says, that "the wages of sin is *not* death but torment," for his assumption that because the sinner "will be multiplying his sins," and that therefore "it will require an additional period to torment him for sins committed while undergoing his first season of torment," does away with the great truth that *death*—deprivation of life—is *the* punishment for sin. But the second death would be as much the punishment for sins committed while the temporary torment was being inflicted, as it would be, or, as mere natural death without a resurrection would be, for the sins of a whole life time. So I think our brother need have no fears about our being swept away in the *torment* current into our "old belief of *eternal torments*."

(6.) Your reply to the reasons I gave why I believed Isa. 26, a discursive prophecy, is, I am satisfied on examination, correct, though it does not thereby follow that it is not a discursive prophecy. My brother will readily admit that a large portion of the book of Isaiah is discursive in its character; he must also admit that it would not be safe to found an argument on, to say the least, doubtful chronological order, as I think he has done in this chapter. If the reader will examine the 25th and 26th chapters of this prophecy in connection, he will doubtless be convinced that *it is discursive*. Note the fact that the resurrection is brought to view in 25: 8, 9, 10, as follows:—"He will swallow up death in victory," * * * "and it shall be said in that day, lo, this is our God, we have waited for him," &c. Note also the connection of the chapters as follows—"In that day shall this song be sung in Israel; we have a strong city," &c.—then at verse 5,—"For he bringeth down them that dwell on high; the lofty city he layeth it low, even to the ground." This of course has reference to events previous to the resurrection brought to view in the language before quoted. Then remember the resurrection is again introduced in 26: 29, and is followed, if not in the same, in the next chapter with events that precede the resurrection—thus

showing conclusively to my mind that th is prophecy is discursive in its character. If so, it follows that my brother's "previous argument on Isa. 26," does *not* "stand unmoved and immovable."

(7.) Again you say, "Br. H.'s critical remarks on 'destroyed together' fail to produce any conviction on our mind that all wicked men are to be destroyed *at once*, and *yakhad* must have the *necessary* sense of *at once* to be available to his view; but it has not necessarily that sense." In replying to this it is only necessary to say that *yakhad* means simply *together*, and while this English word *may* have, as in Ps. 14: 3, to which you refer, a secondary or figurative meaning, yet it is strange to me that my brother should so far forget his own rule of interpreting the language of the Bible as to contend that because this word is so used in one or two places, where it is perfectly plain that *no other sense* can be attached, that it therefore has the *same sense* in other places where no such necessity exists for attaching such a figurative meaning, but on the contrary does violence—taking from the passages their peculiar force.

In the Scripture—"But the transgressors shall be destroyed together," according to my brother's view, the word *"together"* is superfluous; for if the Psalmist did not intend to teach that the wicked would be destroyed at the same time, i. e., "in company," he would doubtless have said, as others of the inspired penmen and as God himself has said—"the wicked shall be destroyed." If my brother on reflection should still contend for the liberty of thus disposing of this word *together*, he certainly cannot any more justly find fault with the 'orthodox' for contending that the words destroy, destruction in these very texts and others also, do not mean that wicked men will be *literally* destroyed: and pardon me when I say, I think *they* have as good ground for so understanding them, with many other of our proof texts, as you have to say that *together* does not, in the passages I presented, mean literally *together*.

But you add, "We will say nothing in defence of our previous illustration of the phrase 'quickened us together with Christ,'" &c., which was in answer to my view of Isa. 1: 28; Ps. 37: 38; Job 21: 30. (Will the reader here refer to No. 10, page 164, and read my rejoinder?) Thus it will be seen that my brother now gives up the main and *only* argument he first presented against the idea that "destroyed together" means *at the same time*. And my present answer to his second argument I submit to the candid consideration of my brother and the readers of the EXAMINER. If it shall be found a good one, then my brother's view that the wicked will be destroyed or rather *die one at a time* and *not* TOGETHER, is proven to be erroneous, and this *alone* would settle the question that the wicked dead must have a resurrection.

(8.) Again you say, "Br. H.'s astonishment at our construction of 2 Peter 2: 9, is reciprocated by ourself at his amazing assumption, that if that text does not refer to a future judgment, when the dead good and bad are to appear, &c., then no text in the Bible does, and Universalists are right." I still firmly believe, my dear brother, that if you take the liberty to so explain 2 Peter 2: 9, as to make the judgment spoken of, refer to the ordinary death of the wicked, one at a time, as you have done, and not to *the* day of judgment in the future, you cannot consistently object to Universalists explaining away in a similar manner as they *can* and *do* every passage in the Bible that relates to the judgment. If such explanation is allowable in Peter 2: 9, it is also allowable in all similar passages. I do not therefore think my statement was an "amazing assumption."

I did not intend by "throwing brackets into" your "language", to misrepresent you; and I cannot *now* see that I did, only in reference to my expression *'natural death'* as applied to the wicked, which for the first time to my knowledge you state you do not believe takes place in their case; *theirs* being a *penal* death, the righteous *only* dying a *natural* death. I must confess I cannot here see the nice distinction my brother does. I believe *all* die a natural death who do not die by *violence* or *accident*.

But I am glad my brother does not "ignore a future judgment day," for reasons before assigned, and for proof of it, he says, "let him turn to vol. 10, pp. 318, 319, and he will learn what he seems never to have read." I will assure my brother that I read all that he writes in the EXAMINER, for I have been too much interested and instructed by his writings to neglect any portion of them; but I am so unfortunate as not to be able to remember *all* I read. I will therefore refer to his language. * * * * * I see by reference that he not only believes in *a* future judgment day for those who may be living at the time of its occurrence, but he believes in many judgment *days* that are in the past, which view I think I could show, if my limits did not forbid, does not agree with the scriptures of truth.

(9.) I will however say, the Bible everywhere speaks of *one* judgment day and *only one*—it is in language as follows—and cannot by any explanation be referred to the day of a man's death, or to the ordinary judgments of God against the nations of the earth—"*the* day of judgment—at *the* judgment—*but after death* THE *judgment*—reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished——It shall be more tolerable for the land of "*Sodom and Gomorrah*," in the day of judgment than for that city, &c., &c. What force has the language in the last quotation if the *people* of Sodom and Gomorrah are not to be raised from the dead and appear at the judgment? To my mind, it is inconsistent to suppose that if there will be so many judgment *days*, as my brother thinks, in different ages of the world, that the inspired penman should say so much about *the* day of judgment to take place at the end of the world or gospel age, and nothing about *the* judgment *days* that were to transpire previous to that. My brother thinks I close "with pretty strong language"—not stronger I think, than the Bible warrants:—and in my "concluding affirmation" I only intended to express my *confident* belief of the statement made; I expected to be so understood.

(10.) In answer to my position that *hades*

contrary to you opinion, yield up all that is in it at the word of the Son of God, as he alone 'has the keys of death and *hades*' and has unequivocally declared that "all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth"—you "observe first, the term *hades* is not in this text at all; it is not the word translated *graves;* it is *mneemeiois;* which we can hardly suppose Jesus would have used if he meant *hades.*" The term here translated graves, which literally means grave, tomb, a sepulchre, must by substitution mean all that *hades* means; to suppose it does not, is to suppose that all who are not in a literal grave, tomb, or sepulchre, will not "come forth" or be raised from the dead according to the words of Jesus. My brother will admit that those of the *righteous* who do not in their death occupy a literal grave or tomb, *are* nevertheless included in the expression "*all that are in the graves.*"—This being true, *observation first* has no force except in my favor. The Revelator says "*death* and *hades* delivered up *the dead* which were in them." I wish to ask my brother, and I hope he will not omit to answer,—*how* can *hades* deliver up all its dead, as it must, unless there be a *resurrection* of all? and *how* can *death* yield up all *its* victims as he must, unless *life* be restored so as to enable them to "*come forth*" from their graves? These are momentous questions, and if not fairly answered, *their* observation second in reference to John 5: 28, 29, that "no life is spoken of as imparted to those who had done evil"—has no force, for *death cannot* be said to deliver up its victims unless *life* is imparted—*death would continue to hold his grasp.* But the unerring word of God declares that *death* and *hades shall* deliver up its dead. Rev. 20: 13.

(11.) But my brother observes third, "Br. H.'s construction destroys the force and peculiarity of our Lord's language, Math. 16, where he saith, 'the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against my church.' That is nothing peculiar to his church, according to Br. H.'s construction; for his theory is, that 'the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against' the wicked dead: all that is in it he affirms shall come out." In reply I remark first, that *katiskusousin*, translated *prevail*, means to overcome; (i. e. to conquer, to vanquish, to subdue,) to prevail against—i. e., "*to obtain the victory,*" &c. Now although I am confident that Jesus has plainly taught in John 5: 28, 29, that *all* will be raised from the dead (and I cannot believe with my brother in *a resurrection from the dead* that excludes *life*) yet I do not understand that he contradicts himself when he says "the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against it," (his church) for he only announces the fact that *hades* shall not *prevail*, or, that his church *shall* prevail—*conquer, subdue*, obtain the victory over *hades*, while the wicked, though *compelled* "*to come forth*" from *hades*, do not prevail—*conquer* or obtain the victory over *hades*—no, my brother, there are no acclamations of the conqueror—no palms of victory—no notes of praise in *their* case—they "come forth" like felons—guilty—miserable—corruptible—that every one of them may be judged according to his works, and then die "the second death." Thus my brother can see the "*peculiarity*" is not in regard to a resurrection simply, but it is in regard to a *victory* over *death* and *hades*, it is a resurrection to *eternal life*, which the wicked cannot enjoy—*they* can never say "death is swallowed up in victory—O death where is thy sting," for *death*, though he temporarily releases his victims, in the end prevails—conquers *them*—they are destroyed—annihilated.

(12.) My brother says, "Observe once more, Br. H.'s view is adverse to any peculiarity in the revival of Christ from the dead. 'Thou wilt not *leave my soul* in hades,' was the assurance of Christ when he descended there. But what of that? no soul of man is to be left there, according to Br. H.; '*all* that is in it, according to his view, *hades* yields up." According to *my view!* Is it not according to Rev. 20: 13? "*Hades yields up,*"—yields up *when?*—three days after death and without seeing corruption? as in the case of Christ! No. Can it be possible my brother relies on such an argument as *this* to sustain his position? Does he not know the passage means—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*" to see corruption?

I cannot think "Br. H.'s view is adverse to any peculiarity in the revival of Christ from the dead," unless he should take the position that *the wicked are raised three days after their death!*

(13.) My brother continues, "We believe it" [that hades yields up all] "is equally 'contrary' to the truth of God's word, if the wicked dead are in hades proper. We believe, however, that the wicked dead fall below hades; i. e., they fall into *gehenna*, from which there is no revival into life." Here is something new, though in rather equivocal language. Do I understand my brother to say the wicked dead do *not* go into *hades* at all, or, that they pass through it in going "below" and so "fall into *gehenna?*" If the former, I reply that as *hades* is the state of death, or state of all the dead, it follows that if the wicked die, they are in *hades* whether they find a sepulchre or not. If my brother means the *latter*, I wish to know *how* the wicked dead can "*fall below hades*" into *gehenna?* and whether *gehenna* is a *place* or a *state?* if a *place*, where is it? and if a *state*, what is the difference between *it* and *hades?* These are a few of the questions that must be satisfactorily answered before this new position and answer to my argument on the destruction of the wicked in *gehenna*, can have any effect on my mind.—Has my brother no other way of fulfilling the words of Christ that the wicked shall be cast into *gehenna*—where they are to be "*burned up root and branch*"? He believes they will have a "resurrection in *some sense.*" Is their resurrection to be from *hades* or *gehenna?* or is it from both—passing through *hades* from "*below*"? In this case, after their resurrection, do they go back to gehenna again? If so, *where is the proof that the wicked are cast into gehenna twice!* If *not, where do they go?* My dear brother, there are too many obstacles in the way of your view, some of which I have presented from time to time, and which have not been in my opinion removed; and until they *are* removed, would forever prevent my

seeing the subject as you do. Others may look at it in a different light; each one must decide for himself, and I trust it will be done with a view to the advancement of TRUTH and the glory of God. Neither have the proof texts and arguments I have presented been, to my mind, disposed of as favoring the non-resurrection of the wicked dead; others may think differently, and probably *will* just as honestly.

(14.) Having, I am fearful, already trespassed upon the columns of your most excellent periodical, I submit my arguments and rejoinders, and other points that I could not now notice, to the candid consideration of the reader.

There is *one* mistake, among others in my last article, whether of the printer or my own carelessness I cannot tell, as I have not an accurate copy, which I wish to correct; it is in second column, page 164. The language *should* be—If this be true, then "*death* doth" *not* "devour and annihilate all them out of Christ," for the FIRE that *is to come down* [*not* is *coming* down every day when a wicked man dies, but is *to* come down] "from God out of heaven DEVOURS them."

(15.) My dear brother, I join with you in saying, "we are at the best fallible beings, and may therefore be mistaken in our construction of the scripture"; and we are perhaps too much in the habit of speaking too *positively* in regard to our convictions of truth: if therefore I have done so, and thereby displeased my brother, as it seems I have, I am very sorry; such was not my intention.

And before I close, let me say that I have no idea that my brother would *knowingly* labor to 'overthrow and render void the *most positive* and most truthful words of our common Master and Redeemer.

Wishing you all prosperity and success in contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, I remain your sincere friend and brother,' H. H. HALL.

Peru, June 24th, 1856.

[See Response page 216.]

DUALISM—Dr. POST.

An intelligent friend communicated the following remarks to us, on *dualism*, &c., which are valuable, and would have been inserted in our Review of Dr. Post if they had been received in time; but as the writer "designs at a future day to publish an argument, theological, exegetical, and historical, upon the subject," it is as well perhaps that we should have his argument complete, and by itself, as to have attached the following to our Review. We hope our friend will furnish his proposed work as early as possible. In speaking of Dr. Post's argument he says:—

"His first article seemed a development of the Dualism to which I think the common doctrine is reducible—the *Dichotomy*, which is Dr. Tholuck's great difficulty with the received doctrine. It has been my special argument for thirty months, that the *eternal necessity* of evil has nothing to boast over an *eternal Principle* of evil,—or that the common view has advantage over that of the Manichaeans and Persians, only in its greater refinement;—a refinement, however, that is shaded with the doctrine of Pythagoras and other philosophers who eternized evil as inseparable from the cosmical system, because they knew no Providence to eliminate it. Accordingly, pursuing the history of Dualism, I found some curious results of the incorporation of philosophic notions with Christianity. TATIAN is the first one who speaks of *penal immortality*. Consistently enough, he was the founder of the sect of Eneratites who forbade marriage.—Was it because he thought matter in itself corrupt? or was it because the parental relation was not to be sought, if ones child might be an immortal fiend? I care not which answer is given. A hundred years later MANES himself appeared, to offer relief to the theology of the church, by fathering the eternal evil now believed, on an evil Deity. And the church found herself in new trouble, because Manes found so many proselytes from among her children. But how to extricate herself from her dilemma?—*Gracious* immortality was getting odious then, as it is now. But the eternity of evil was a felt and galling hardship. In a debate purporting to have been held between Manes and Archelaus, ab. 270, the latter when pressed, broadly hints that evil men will one day cease to be. "If the human race should at length perish from the earth, in such a way that they can sin no more, the substance of this evil tree, bearing no more fruit, would perish."—"And when will that thing happen that you tell of?"—"I am only a man, and do not know what will come; nevertheless I shall not leave that point without saying something upon it." And again—"Therefore it (death) has an end, because it began in time; and that was true which was spoken—'Death is swallowed up in victory.' For it was not unbegotten, but is shown to have both beginning and end."—*Routh's Reliquiæ Sacræ*, vol. iv., pp. 182, 183, 205. Archelaus' solution of the End of Evil is, however, restorationist. Thus he explains Matt. xiii: 13, and 2 Cor. iv: 3, 4, with the remark "ut interpretantur nonnulli, horum enim non est illaudabilis oratio."—p. 280.

Fifty years later LACTANTIUS took up the prevailing Dualism, and adorned it with the form of the old philosophy of an eternal necessity, such as is found in Philo, Plato, and whom not. With him, evil is a fruit of the original plan of the world. (1.) It is necessary, to illustrate the nature of good. (2.) Christ and Satan are respectively the right hand and left hand of God. (3.) Satan is an anti-God, the rival of the true God. (4.) Over and over again he speaks of evil as essential to the existence of good, by a law of contraries, or a polarity of forces, of which neither can subsist without the other. (5.)

This Dualism was so manifest, however, that

(1 to 5.) The references we have omitted.—ED. EXR.

even in this philosophic form it was not acceptable at a later age. Two of the most objectionable passages were omitted from the later manuscripts and earlier editions of Lactantius. But those editors who have suppressed the passages confess the *style* to be that of Lactantious, and Haghenbac (Hist. of Doc. § 133,) and Dr. Hase, (Ch. Hist. § 88,) regard them as genuine.

This Dualism lived a persecuted life for some centuries, and has slumbered for some centuries more. It showed a galvanic sort of life in the scepticism of Bayle, who maintained for argument's sake, that Manichaeism, with all its absurdities, was better than any other theory of evil, and who brought out the concession of Le Clerc, that those who held the doctrine of life in Christ alone (the Socinians,) could better answer the arguments of the Manichaens than any other school of theologians.

Dualism has been thought dead. "The world is not likely to see a revival of it," we are told.—[Christian Theism. (The Burnet Prize Essay,) p. 278.] But a more profound writer says, "the theological and philosophical character of the present time can only furnish us with a poor guarantee that perhaps very soon the inclination to a dualistic consideration of the world will not extend itself in a similar manner as a few decennaries ago."—(Muller, Christian Doctrine of Sin, I. 441.) Among various symptoms of this, one of the most palpable is the saying in that wild Procin of Bailey's Festus, so exactly Lactantian, "Evil and good are God's right hand and left."

From this history you need not wonder that on reading Dr. Post's first article, I remarked that on his view, we might say of Satan the same that was said of a creature far more innocent, "the Lord hath need of him." I did rejoice in the progress of the current theology towards what I regard its true goal;—and the sooner it finds itself there, the better.

But this sort of argument, I am aware, is not the best for all readers, though I think it quite as intelligible as the Ciceronian style of Dr. Post. Among the things I have collected are, however, some passages which I do not know whether you have seen. Their bearings on certain facts of the argument are obvious. Hereis from *Richard Baxter*, pertinent to the question whether eternal death in the literal sense is eternal punishment: "Would you not be contented to suffer a terrible degree of misery everlastingly rather than die? Whatever men may say, it is certain they would. Though not to live to us, is better than to live in hell, yet men would live in very great misery, than not live at all, if they had their choice."—(The Unreasonableness of Infidelity, Part I. Spirit's Witness, Works. Lond. 1830; vol. xx., p. 31.) And here is found *Hermann Witsius*, whose "Economy of the Covenants" is a towering and lasting monument of unimpeachable orthodoxy. "But whether it be necessary, that God should continue forever the sinful creature in a state of existence, I own I am ignorant. May it not, in its measure, be reckoned an infinite punishment, should God please to doom man, who was by nature a candidate for eternity, to total annihilation, from whence he should never be suffered to return to life? I know, God has now determined otherwise, and that with the highest justice. But it is queried, whether agreeably to His justice He might not have settled it in this manner: If thou, O man, sinnest, I will frustrate thy desire of eternal happiness, and of a blessed eternity, and on the contrary give thee up to eternal annihilation. Here at least, let us hesitate, and suspend our judgment."—(Econ. of C. Book I., ch. v., § xlii.) Hear him, also, on the import of *Puraiōnios*.—After saying that the words in Jude, v: 7, are "not to be restricted to that fire wherewith those cities were burnt, but to be extended to the flames of hell, with which the lewd inhabitants of those cities are to this very day tormented,"—he says—"But it is true of both (the inhabitants and the towns,) that they were burnt with fire; which, with respect to the towns, may in some measure be said to be eternal, they being so consumed as that they never shall or can be restored."—(Bk. I. ch. v.)—But manifestly, if the phrase *eternal fire* has a fair sense when applied to the cities or people as consumed utterly and forever, to extend its meaning *explains* nothing, and of course *proves* nothing. F.

OBITUARY.—Br. Joseph Eaton communicates the intelligence that our aged sister ANNE POTTER, of Leonardsburg, Ohio, has fallen asleep in Jesus, in her 78th year. She was the mother, we suppose, of Br. Eaton's wife. More than thirty years since she became, says Br. E., "the subject of that *good hope through grace*, 2 Thess. 2: 16, and joined the regular Baptists. Some eight weeks before her death she was attacked, 1st by a dropsical affection of the heart; and 2d, with a paralisis of the left side. She was apprehensive from the commencement of the former, that *the days of her appointed time had come*, Job. 14: 14; that she 'should go whence she should not return, to the land of darkness as darkness itself,' Job 10: 22; where, 'in death there is *no remembrance* of Thee,' (the Lord.) Psa. 6: 5; but having been 'begotten anew by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ to the *Hope of Life*,' (Syriac Translation, 1 Peter 1: 3,) and having 'obtained like precious faith,' 2 Peter 1: 1, she viewed her *Redeemer* standing on the *earth* in the *latter day*,' Job 19: 25, and would ransom her from the POWER of the grave—or state of the dead—and *redeem* her from *death*,' Hosea 13: 14, and thus 'be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God,' Rom. 8: 21." Thus writes Br. Eaton. Sister Potter had been long a subscriber to the BIBLE EXAMINER.

ERRATA.—In my "Response to H. Grew's Second Reply," in EXAMINER "No. 17," are the following errors, none of which, I am confident, were in my manuscript. In sec. "4" there should be no comma after the compound word "post-resurrection" in the 37th line; the word is intended as an adjective, qualifying "tribulation and anguish," whereas the comma converts it into a noun and destroys the sense. In the same sec., 44th line, the "&c." should be included in the preceding parenthesis. In sec. "6," 41st line, for "offer"

read "afford." In sec. "8," 6th line, for "*illiptical* and illipsis" read *elliptical* and ellipsis." In the same sec., 11th line, for "sense" read "verse." In sec. "10," 6th line, for "teaches" read "teach."

July 17, 1856. MACKNIGHT, JR.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, August, 1856.

Will the Wicked Dead be Made Alive?

The discussion of the above question has been protracted to greater length than we ever anticipated, or than is desirable in the EXAMINER, as it occupies too much space to the exclusion of other matter. Hereafter, for a time at least, we are of opinion that none but short articles should be inserted on this topic. If any are still anxious to speak on the question, and have anything new to offer, let them condense their ideas so that no article shall fill exceeding two or three columns.—As a general rule, such articles, in this stage of the question, will be read with more interest and be better understood than longer ones.

The following letter from DR. HUNTINGTON makes a suggestion worthy of attention; and we publish it, first to say, that we most sincerely hope that no one will ever embrace any doctrine "from over-confidence in a respected teacher." We should deeply regret and deprecate such conversions.—Let sober judgment, based on your own understanding of the teaching of the Bible, be your guide, praying for the aid of the Divine Spirit of God to enlighten your understanding. Then, whatever conclusion you arrive at, you will have the consciousness of sincerity in seeking after truth, and you will not err fatally, if you err at all.—Secondly, we publish this letter that others may express their views of the propriety and desirableness of a "pamphlet" on the question, as suggested by Br. Huntington.

BROOKLYN, Con., July 18th, 1856.

Dear Brother.—I have for some time wished to make a suggestion to you, but have not been fully satisfied that it was yet time. But the short article in your July number, respecting the comparative number of those who had embraced the doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked, determined me. I have been more advantaged by the instruction obtained from your publication than from any other one of the many which I take. But while I mean to keep my mind in an attitude open to conviction on any Bible truth, I do not intend, *from over-confidence* in a respected teacher, to take hastily an idea so entirely new. I have been very much interested in the discussion of this subject thus far; and I must say that I have been benefitted also; but I do not see that *this mode* of warfare is as well calculated to bring the thing to a happy and speedy *conclusion* as another.—What I wish to propose is that you take up the subject in a pamphlet of sufficient size to afford room for the fair and full exhibition of the question, and let us have it in a shape in which we can have a plain view of the whole matter without the breaks and distractions of a protracted controversy. This you did successfully, in your Six Sermons, on that question; and I hope you will think best to do so in this. I express no opinion in the case myself as yet, but I do want to see a different presentation of it, if it can be had. What may be the sentiments of other subscribers, or their wishes I have no means of knowing. I make this suggestion independently, as I stand nearly alone in this community.

Yours truly, in the love of *the truth*,

THOMAS HUNTINGTON.

Response to Br. Hall's Fourth Rejoinder.

In reference to Br. Hall's introductory remarks, we regret if we gave place to any expression in our last response that seemed unkind or unreasonable. We intended no disrespect to Br. H., whom we highly esteem. It is possible that we "intimated very plainly that it is not agreeable to protract" the discussion on the preposition "in," as there seemed to us to be no probability of either of us enlightening the readers of the EXAMINER any more on that subject; and we are of the same opinion still. That was the point on which our discussion was opened; and we certainly had no idea of its taking the wide range it did, immediately, or we could not have consented to have gone into the subject at all, at *that time*. Br. Grew and his Respondent had hardly completed their discussion when the "preposition" came up; and we did decline going into the general discussion, immediately, with another. We were willing after a while to do so. That Br. H. had not "referred to a single article of" Br. Grew's, does not alter the fact that "much of the same ground" was travelled over, and that such a course made it embarrassing to us, as we did not feel that our readers could be edified by our repeating what the respondent of Br. G. had said on the same texts introduced in this new discussion on 1 Corth. 15: 22.

We will now proceed, as briefly as possible, to reply to Br. H.'s fourth rejoinder. We have numbered the sections of his article to which we reply to save quoting his words, and the reader will please refer back to the corresponding sections, else he will not understand our remarks.

"(1.)" Why Br. H. should wish to press us to disclaim further, meaning what our words seem to

import, we cannot tell. To avoid multiplying words we entered a simple disclaimer in our last reply. We admit we expressed ourself at first without sufficiently guarding our meaning. We afterwards disclaimed intending to convey the idea which the words perhaps naturally imported. We regret we were so unfortunate in our first expression. We now say, that to change *in* to *by*, Corth. 15: 22, is critically wrong, because such a change contradicts the entire argument of the apostle in that chapter, and makes him contradict himself in his testimony, Rom. 8: 11, (see EXAMINER, page 123), and cannot therefore be admitted at all; and furthermore, no argument from 1 Corth. 15, for the living again of the wicked dead, is of any avail to the affirmative; nor are any inferences from that chapter to have any weight in deciding the question in favor of the affirmative, "unless positive testimony of the living again of the wicked dead can be found in other portions of inspiration, which, as yet, has not been done to our mind"; but even if that could be done, the subject and the argument of the apostle in this chapter forbid changing *in* to *by* in verse 22. That was what we *meant*.

A "Liberal Translation" of the New Testament by E. HARWOOD, published in London in 1768, reads the verse thus—"For as by Adam all the human race was subjected to *mortality:* so by Christ Jesus shall all the pious dead be entitled to *immortality*."

"(2.)" This section of Br. H.'s article shows that he either did not read what the Respondent to Br. Grew wrote, or his memory is treacherous; for nearly every point he has introduced here was considered in that discussion. The Respondent of Br. Grew nor ourself ever hinted that the "skeletons or corpses" of the wicked dead were to "be raised up." Br. H. says—"My brother admits the wicked will have a resurrection of some kind"; * * * "in what 'sense' they are to have a resurrection we have not yet been informed." Will Br. H. now blame us for saying, he has "*compelled*" us to go over much of the same ground that was traveled with Br. Grew?

In the EXAMINER of Dec. 1st of last year the Respondent of Br. Grew said—

"We admitted that the wicked dead will have a resurrection 'in some sense'; but in *what* sense we did not pretend to say, and it is useless to speculate about it: but until they are said to be made *alive*, by at least one text of scripture, we do not feel under obligation to submit to any man's opinion that they will be, while the Bible declares *positively* they '*shall not see life.*'"

Respondent being still urged by Br. Grew on this point, in January of this year (see EXAMINER page 10), spoke as follows:—

The "*sense*," in which the wicked dead may have a resurrection, we may illustrate by a remark in one of our city papers, on the late trial of BAKER for the murder of POOLE. The latter's character had been made a subject of investigation during the trial, by Baker's counsel. The city paper thus speaks:—

"The censure of the Judge upon the prisoner's counsel, for stripping the shroud as it were from the *dead Poole*, or rather for RECALLING HIM TO LIFE, *such as he actually had been while among us*, appears to us to have been entirely unjust and uncalled for."

This remark shows that the idea of "a resurrection in *some sense*," short of actual *life*, is an admissible one; and until there is *positive* evidence to the contrary—which we have not yet seen in this discussion—we must repeat what we said at the outset, we *doubt* if the wicked dead will ever have a revival into *actual life*. In the sense in which "the dead Poole" had a "recalling to life," we see no objection to admitting their resurrection.

On the subject of John 5: 28, 29, and hearing the voice, though dead, let the reader see the EXAMINER of November 1st, of last year; but as some of our subscribers have not that volume we are "compelled" to repeat what was then said on the same topic; and though it occupies near three columns, let it be read again carefully. It is as follows:—

"It seems now, the strength of the affirmative, so far as positive testimony is concerned, is in John 5: 28, 29. On this text Br. Grew '*concedes* that the term *resurrection* may not of itself necessarily imply being made alive,' &c.; but he says, the 'text declares something *more* than a resurrection: it declares that the very same persons who come forth to the resurrection of condemnation shall HEAR his voice, the literal sense of which term necessarily implies *life*.' He asks, 'Is it *an inference* that the wicked shall *hear* his (the Saviour's) voice? Can they hear without *life?*' We respond—

"It would be in harmony with other scriptures to say the *dead* must hear *before* they have *life*, or else it is not the voice to *the dead*, but to the living. This point may be illustrated by the direction of God to the prophet Ezekiel—'O ye dry bones, *hear* the word of the Lord.' Ezk. 37: 4. While the prophet made this proclamation, at God's command, 'There was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone; and the sinews and flesh came up on them, and the skin covered them above; but there was *no breath* in them;' Ezk. 37: 7, 8.

"Here then is a clear case in which the *dead*, without *life*, even 'dry bones,' did HEAR. Hence the fact that *all* in their graves *hear* the voice of the Saviour does not prove that they *live* or are

made *alive;* and the text John 5: 28, 29 seems to fail of being *positive* testimony that those who have done evil are made alive at the resurrection; and if this text is not positive testimony there surely seems to be none in the Bible on the affirmative side.

"No matter how *literal* the main part of a text is, there may be a word in it which we are compelled to take in a figurative sense. 'Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the kingdom of God;' Lk. 9: 60. Every part of this text is literal with the exception of one word, and that word is the same as another in the text that is literal; 'Let the *dead* bury their *dead*.'—The latter death is literal, but the former, Br. G. will not doubt, is figurative. The term dead does not mean the same thing in both instances, though in a very literal text. Why then may not the same be true in John 5: 28, 29? If the good and evil are both said to have a *resurrection*, the *first* resurrection, *viz:* of the good, may embrace being made *alive*, nay, must embrace life, because it is expressly said it is a resurrection to *life*, while the other differs in its character, and is not to the extent of a revival into life? Such we think may be the case, unless some other text expressly declares the wicked dead shall *live again*. We confess we are ignorant of any such text; while we have presented several which declare they shall *not live*—nor *see life*, but the wrath of God abideth on them. Br. G. has endeavored to harmonize these *positive* declarations—that the wicked shall not see life, and shall not live, from the dead—with what he supposes to be the sense of John 5: 28, 29. He thinks there is no 'necessity for qualifying' the terms in this text, while there must be in such as say the wicked 'shall not see life,' &c. He may be correct, but we doubt it.

"We see 'no necessity for qualifying the term *life*' in the text 'He that believeth not the Son *shall not see life*,' John 3: 36. We have shown that 'no necessity' exists for it on the score of *hearing;* for 'dry bones,' in scripture language, *hear*. 'No necessity' exists to our mind from the language our brother quotes to illustrate, *viz:* 'except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,' &c., on which he remarks—"Now as these persons had *life* in their unbelief, the phrase 'ye have no life in you' must mean ye have no *eternal* life." But, 'it is *manifest*' that the life they had 'in unbelief'—*i. e.*, animal, or Adamic life—'is excepted,' as Paul said of another matter, 1 Corth. 15: 27; but it is *not* manifest that 'life, after the first death,' is excepted in the phrase 'shall *not see life;* but the wrath of God abideth on them.'—We see no grounds for any other construction of this language than its plain and obvious import, unless it can be shown by positive testimony that unbelievers shall live again. Besides, the text quoted by our brother, from John 6: 53, 54—as an illustration of the 'necessity' for qualifying the term *life*—makes against his view. Look at it. 'Ye have no life in you,' but he that 'drinketh my blood hath *life;* and I will raise HIM up at the last day.' This last clause seems entirely superfluous unless the unbelievers are *excluded* from being raised up, or from being made alive. That the Jews, of our Saviour's time, did not believe their fathers, who died in the wilderness, would have a resurrection, is attested by Dr. ADAM CLARKE; and our Saviour seems to confirm that idea by saying in this very connection, 'Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and *are dead;*' and adds, 'This is the bread which cometh down from heaven that a man may eat thereof and *not die*.' And why *not die?* Because, 'I will raise *him* up at the last day,' but 'your fathers *are dead;*' *i. e.*—as seems probable—'I will *not* raise *them* up at the last day;' *they* 'shall not see life;' but it is not true of them alone who died in the wilderness, 'Verily, I say unto *you*, except *ye* eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, *ye* have no life in *you*' any more than your fathers who died in the wilderness. Such may be the true import of this discourse, and it tends to confirm the idea that the wicked dead shall not be made alive again.

"The scriptures give us no account of but two literal lives. The first is derived from mortal Adam, and continues till death, both, in the righteous and wicked. That life is *then extinct;* there is no power of revival from the dead by that life. There is one other life, and that is derived from the *immortal* Adam, or Christ. This latter life is like its author's, *eternal;* and *all* who are partakers of it live from the dead, and live forever. As they have borne the image of the earthy, or first Adam, so shall they bear the image of the heavenly, or second Adam; and as is the earthy such are they also that are earthy. So Paul talks 1 Corth. 15. If man is made *alive* from the dead by the second Adam, he is made alive by *a life that is eternal;* and puts on immortality and incorruption. So Paul seems to reason. That life is a life from the dead; and it would seem as if no idea of the living again of any but those *in* Christ entered into Paul's theology, as set forth in 1 Corth. 15. Any life subsequent to death is by and from Christ, 'at the last day.' No such life, it would seem, can ever become extinct; therefore the wicked '*shall not see life*.' Indeed, Paul declares those who are made *alive* by Christ, in the resurrection, were 'sown in corruption' and 'raised in *incorruption;*' and that '*the dead* shall be raised *incorruptible*:' hence there can be no dying again of those who are made *alive* by the resurrection; and the Saviour does not tell us, John 5: 28, 29, that any are made alive by the resurrection except 'they that have done *good*:' and he farther tells us, Lk. 20: 36, that those who are 'accounted worthy to obtain that world, (*kai*) *even* the resurrection *from* the dead,' *cannot* 'die any more.' Thus it seems the idea that the wicked dead will be made alive again is contradicted by the plain teaching of our Lord and the apostle Paul. All that are made *alive* are declared to be beyond the reach of dying again, are incorruptible and immortal. We know of no text that says any who are in a resurrection state are *mortal* or capable of dying again."

We need add nothing to the foregoing extract in response to Br. H.'s section "(2)," except to say, the scriptures do not, that we remember, speak

of a "second blast" of the last trumpet; and as he seems to admit the wicked dead may not hear the first so as to awake, we rather think "*they shall not see life,* but the wrath of God abideth on them." John 3: 36.

"(3.)" Br. H. here admits that Christ is a blessing to all men "in the sense of respite from punishment," &c. Very well. But he says, if the sinner does not improve this "respite" it "would not be a blessing in the end." Indeed! Nor will Christ's coming be a "curse in the end." If dying, famishing men refuse to eat food kindly offered them, and choose to die rather than receive the bounty of the kind donor, does the donor or his offered bounty prove a curse in the end? Not at all. They would have died if no provision had been made for them; their rejection or neglect of it does not convert it into a curse; but they manifest their folly and madness by their course, and fall under the curse of death notwithstanding the kind provision offered; but the provision was not a curse in any sense. But Br. H. makes an attempt to convict us of being "at issue with" Paul. How does he do this? He says, "The economy of the gospel is, that it proves" * * * "a savor of death unto death, and therefore a 'curse' unto those that reject the gospel."

Now such a construction of the apostle's language, we conclude, is a simple misunderstanding of the apostle's object in what he says. The text and context shows that it was a simple expression of apostolic gratitude that he had not labored in vain: that "unto God" the apostle was "a sweet savor of Christ" in that he had so fully proclaimed God's love in Christ. If some who were dying did not profit by the good news and died after all, nevertheless, "unto God," Paul was still "a sweet savor," by having diffused, or made "manifest the savor of His knowledge in every place"; verse 14. Some believed and would have life: others disbelieved and would die; but in either case Paul lost not his "sweet savor unto God."

When Br. H. proves that the proper and final wages of sin is anything more or different from "death" it will be time enough to talk about one sinner having "greater punishment than" another. That in this present life "the way of the transgressor is hard," Prov. 13: 15, and the more light and knowledge a man has and sins against it the harder his way is, and the more "stripes" he receives, is an undoubted truth; but that transgressors are to be made alive from the dead that some may receive "greater punishment" than others is what the scriptures nowhere assert. "*The wages of sin is* DEATH," Rom. 6: 23. All talk about "degrees of punishment"—when relating to punishment as final—is but the traditions of men.—While in this present state the matter is entirely different: here, men suffer, in some form, in various degrees; often, however, known only to God and themselves; or it may be they now suffer as a warning and admonition to others of the race to avoid sin; as for example, the old world, Sodom, the Canaanites, and Jerusalem at its destruction: but the scriptures give us no information that such will be the case in another life. Confirmed and "incorrigible" sinners, of every class and degree, have one common destiny, *viz:* DEATH: and we "see" the most perfect "justice in this," whether Br. H. can, or not.

(4.) That the "sentiment ascribed" to Br. H. was legitimate, from his words, no one will deny who reads his remarks in his previous article; but as he disclaims the sentiment we have no disposition to press it.

Br. H.'s remarks on Rom. 2 are all met by the Respondent of Br. Grew: see EXAMINER Oct. 15, 1855, page 315 to 319. We do not choose to travel over that ground at this time, so soon after the thorough sifting the subject then had. What Br. H. says about "*pangs* connected with the second death," for some sinners more than others, being entirely a matter of his *opinion,* we shall say nothing in reply till he presents proof of it, which as yet we have never seen. His phraseology that men are to be "punished according to the deeds done in the body" is a very common one, and as unscriptural as it is common. The good and the bad are to "*receive* the things in body, according to that" they have "done, whether good or bad." The good "receive" *life;* the bad "receive" death. But the terms good and bad, here, may possibly be used only relatively, or comparatively of believers; so that while they all receive life some may receive the perquisites of that life in a less degree than others; because, though they built on Christ they built also "wood, hay, and stubble"; or brought in useless matter which cannot stand the test of that day: hence they "suffer loss" though they are "saved, yet so as by fire." See 1 Cor. iii: 11–15. This is "according to that" each has done. The justice and equity of God are thus fully manifested. Men might as well talk about degrees in *hanging*—where the crime is punishable with death—as about degrees of punishment in "the wages of sin," which "is death." Br. H. is, as well as others, still entangled in "torment" doctrine. They seem to fear, as much as endless misery believers do,

that death is too easy a punishment; and they must superadd more or less torment; but for what conceivable end, unless to gratify revenge, we cannot see, as the sinner is not to be benefitted by it, and there are none of Adam's race, at that time, that can be benefitted by it, as all the good are made immortal, and all the wicked are hopelessly lost.

Br. H. attempts to escape the result of his theory's making Christ's resurrection a great curse to the heathen, or those who never heard of Christ, because but for it such would never have lived again —as he had previously admitted. But his attempt, though creditable to his heart, involves him in still deeper mazes or perplexities; for, according to his new version of the matter, infinite wisdom could not devise a "plan" for man's redemption without its being "inseparably connected" with the resurrection of these heathen "because his" (Christ's) "resurrection is inseparably connected with the gospel plan which was conceived in the infinite Mind" * * * "before the fall of Adam."

This caps the climax of all the arguments we have yet seen to prove the wicked dead are to be revived into a "*temporary* life." God "conceived this plan before the fall of Adam." Really we would like to know where revelation makes known such an idea. Paul tells us, "God, that cannot lie, promised *eternal* life before the world began"—*pro chronōn aiōniōn*, before the ages began, or a long time ago; Titus 1: 2. But where the scriptures tell us of God's "plan before the fall of Adam" for a "temporary life" after death for any one we have yet to learn. The fact is, revival from the dead is a gospel benefit; and, so far as we have scripture to guide us, such re-living is to eternal life and immortality; and no "temporary life" is ever brought to light, by the gospel, as the result of "Christ's resurrection."

Br. H. now discards his admission, of March 1st, page 65, where he spoke as follows—

"The apostle was doubtless showing that *if* Christ was not resurrected, then there would be no resurrection of *the dead*—righteous or wicked."

This admission has been very troublesome to Br. H., in this discussion. This idea is now abandoned by him, at least, "in one sense," as "absurd." We trust he will yet see it is far more absurd to affirm a part of the human family have a temporary life inflicted upon them, by being made alive from the dead, just to kill them again; for there is where his present course is drifting him, as the next section will show.

"(5.)" We beg the reader to turn back and read this section of Br. H.'s article over again: do not fail to do so. We have half a mind not to say one word by way of comment upon it. It is a rich contrast to Br. Grew's views on the subject; but we sincerely hope the latter will not be stirred up to an attack on B. H. for it: it would be "out of order" to do so just now. After "patience" has had its "perfect work," if he wishes to take his colleague in hand for giving up the "positive infliction of pain," and "positive punishment by God," and leaving the "stings of conscience," in a "natural result," to punish the sinner, &c., he may have a chance to do so.

But how Br. H. gets all the wicked dead not only alive but to "come up on the breadth of the new earth," and "see the beautiful earth arrayed in living green," &c., we cannot tell, as the "new earth" does not appear till *after* death and hell, and all whose names are not written in the book of life are cast into the lake of fire. He must have been thinking of Mr. Miller's theory and not of the Bible testimony. But we will not discuss that point in this place.

Br. H. is easing off the revived wicked from torment; for in speaking of their being "devoured, burned up," he says—

"This would not be so horrible and cruel a death as many martyrs have suffered at the hands of the enemies of the cross."

Thus Br. H. would let off the cruel murderers of Christ and his followers with a less horrible and cruel death than they inflicted on the martyrs. Truly Br. H.'s heart is beginning to be touched with a sense of the injustice of torturing men just for the sake of tormenting them; and we have hope that he may yet see that the revival of the wicked dead into life, to show them the new earth —to have their consciences sting them more, and kill them again an easier death than the martyrs died, is without any scripture authority, and is repugnant to the whole letter and spirit of Christ's mission into the world, and subversive of that gracious design of God's love in giving His Son that "whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."

"(6.)" We pass this section without comment.

"(7.)" To travel over the ground of this section again would be only to repeat and multiply words. Let the reader see our previous response. Our mind is unchanged; and we have given "up" nothing of our first or second "argument" on the term "together." We are satisfied it does not mean what Br. H. contends for. Before passing

the topic entirely, however, we will add, that Br. H.'s theory of all the wicked being destroyed at *one and the same time* is utterly irreconcilable with his idea that the wicked are all raised to life after the creation of the new earth, on which he says they are to come up. The word of truth declares *positively*, that "*when* the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels," * * * "them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel" * * * "shall be punished with *everlasting* destruction," and that this is to be "*when* he"—Jesus—"shall come to be glorified *in his saints*," &c. Now if after this "everlasting destruction" they are to be made alive—as Br. H.'s theory necessarily implies—in order that all the wicked, who have ever lived on the earth, may be destroyed "together," in his sense of that term, then have we no assurance that any destruction of the wicked is "*everlasting*"; for after having been "destroyed together" they may be made alive again to die no more. If the everlasting destruction of the wicked at the coming of Christ "from heaven" can be reversed, so can any other everlasting destruction.

"(8.)" We beseech the reader to look at our remarks on the subject of this section, page 171; and also to examine our references on that page to vol. 10, pp. 318 319—and not leave Br. H. to do it alone—and see if there is any just ground for Br. H.'s reiterating the idea that we hold "the judgment spoken of, refers to the ordinary death of the wicked, one at a time." We hold no such sentiment, and have never promulgated any such sentiment. If any one wishes to know our views of the judgment day, they can see them in the places referred to and in the present vol. pp. 4 to 7.

"(9.)" We have no wish to draw Br. H. into a controversy on his assumption of "one judgment day and one only"; for we fear our readers may think we have entirely lost sight of the first grand question—"Is there positive testimony that the wicked dead will be made *alive?*"

Because the phrase "the day of judgment" occurs several times, in different places in the Bible, does any one believe it always refers to a particular day for all men that have ever lived on earth? We do not if Br. H. does; and we are of opinion that some of the best scripture expositors will be found to take the same view we do of those texts on which Br. H. has here placed the greatest reliance. Take his text about Sodom, &c. What is the subject? It is the judgment of certain cities. "Thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be brought down to hell"—*hades*—"for if the mighty works which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day: but I say unto you," (Capernaum) "that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee"—Capernaum. Now observe, the day of judgment here spoken of is the day of Capernaum's visitation for its disregard of Jesus' works. Sodom was judged, overthrown, and did *not* "remain until this day" in which Christ spoke; therefore judgment had been executed on that city. Now what? The day of Capernaum's judgment was at hand, and it was to be more intolerable than that inflicted on Sodom. The day of judgment on Sodom was sudden and entire, at once. Capernaum's was protracted and covered a length of time; but, says KITTO, in his Biblical Literature, "The denunciation *has been* so completely accomplished, that even the site of Capernaum is quite uncertain." That Jerusalem's overthrow by the Romans was its judgment day, is clear from the fact that Jesus declares explicitly—"These be the days of vengeance, that *all things* which are written may be fulfilled," Lk. 21: 22 and connection, and Paul declares, "Wrath is come upon them to the *uttermost*," 1 Thes. 2: 16. Jesus saith, "*Now* is the judgment of this world," John 12: 31. And Peter saith, "*The time is come* that judgment must begin at the house of God," &c., 1 Pet. 4: 17. That the "inspired penmen should" *also* speak "about the day of judgment to take place at the end of" * * * "the gospel age," is not incompatible with "many days of judgment." Not to admit this, is to deny facts, and launch into inextricable confusion. So it appears to us; but we cannot suffer ourself to be led out any further on this subject, at present.

"(10.)" We have little disposition to open another controversy on a single word. We stated the fact that *mneemeiois* is the word translated graves, John 5: 28, and *not* hades; and that Jesus would hardly have used that word if he meant *hades*, and we are of the same opinion still.

We now tell Bro. H. and all others, that to build the doctrine of the *re-living* of all the literal dead upon John 5: 28, 29, is, in our opinion, to build on a slender foundation. The term *mneemeiois*, is used for the places from whence the demoniacs issued. Thus, Math. 8: 28, it is said, "Then met Jesus two possessed with devils, coming *out of the tombs*"—*mneemeiōn*. They had not been in *hades*, neither had they been *dead*. On this word DR. BLOOMFIELD says—"Tombs"

* * * "often served as places of shelter to the houseless wanderer: and WM. RAMSEY, D. D., in his "Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion," p. 34, says:

"The tombs (*mnemaia*) are very abundant in some parts of the Eastern world unto this day.—They are houses built over the graves of distinguished or wealthy persons by the governments of which they were honored members, or their relatives. They are of different sizes and shapes.—Some are built square, others round, and from ten to thirty feet high. The most of those that are yet to be found in India were built by the Mohammedans. They are now used as dwellings or as stopping-places for travellers, being fitted up for these purposes. But formerly, no one dwelt in them—the friends of the deceased only visited them for prayer. I have often lodged in these tombs while on missionary tours. We found them comfortable lodgings; and to those who are fond of retirement, they afford an agreeable resting place."

Here also we may as well insert again the remarks of C. C. FRENCH, in the EXAMINER of Dec. 1st last year, on John 5: 28, 29. He say—

"The original word translated "*graves*" here, is not *hades*, from which the dead are to be raised in the literal resurrection, but it is "*tois mneemeiois*," the graves dug into the earth. Josephus informs us, (War, Bk. 6, chap. 9, sect 4, and in other places,) that many of the Jews had made graves for themselves in the city of Jerusalem, and were brought forth to be slain, and led captive at the destruction. (See Heb. 11: 38; Isa. 2: 19; Ezek. 33: 27.) About three millions of the Jews were assembled in Jerusalem, at the passover, when the Roman army surrounded the city, (Joseph. 2, 14, 3, note, and 6, 9, 3, and note:) the necessity of making graves to retire into is apparent. The resurrection (*anastasin*) was a standing upon the feet again. When the *literal* resurrection is referred to, the expression is not *anastasin* simply, but *hee anastasin*. (That Greek article "*hee*" is of some importance in a discussion relative to the "resurrection of the wicked *dead*.") The word "*anastasin*," in the text rendered *resurrection*, simply signifies the act of rising from a sitting or reclining posture; from a seat on the ground; a rising up; a starting up, &c. See Donnegan's Lexicon. It is not a "resurrection from the *dead*."

Mr. Fisk, in his Greek Grammar, says—"When no article is expressed in Greek, the English, indefinite article *a* is signified." Then, should we not read of *a* "day of judgment" oftener than we do? Should we not read of *a* resurrection in John 5: 29?

After all that has been said on this text, it is not absolutely certain that it relates to the living again from literal death at all; and in the absence of any other text affirming that all dead men, good and bad, are made *alive*, we think the affirmative of the question, so long under discussion, have very little ground to stand on, though they fought bravely, and have seemed as determined to hold on as the advocates of endless misery are to their few texts; and we now say, in our judgment, one has just as much real proof of their positions as the other. Life from the dead—whether spiritual or literal—is only through and by a union with Christ the *Life-Giver*. All others die in their sins, and under the curse of the law; which law holds them eternally back from life, so that they "shall not see life." If the wicked dead are in hades, at the final disposal of all men, that state shall not prevent their character—and of course does not prevent them, from a judicial investigation and decision, though dead; and as "dead" they "stand before God." So saith the text to which Br. H. refers, Rev. 20: 12, 13, but not as actually alive; for, clearly, it is only those whose names were written in the *book of life* that are made alive; all "whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Hades, or the covered state, that state of the dead preceding the final result to the race, is destroyed as having no farther use, and *gehenna* alone remains to all whose names were not written for life. "Death and hades delivered up the dead," be it remembered, to be "*judged;*" and not one word is said of any being made *alive* except those whose names were "found written in the book of life."

If Br. H. will solve Isa. 14: 9—16, we think he will get an answer to his inquiries on Rev. 20: 13. The terms hell and grave, in Isa. 14, are both *sheol* in the original, answering to *hades* Rev. 20. If sheol can "stir up the dead" in it and set them to *talking*, without their being *alive*, so can hades "deliver up the dead" in it in the same way; and the advocates of the immortal-soul theory have just as much evidence from Isa. 14 that dead men are alive as Br. H. has from Rev. 20, that the wicked dead will be made alive.

"(11.)" It is almost cruel to make any reply to this section of Br. H.'s article. He had said all that are in hades shall come out. We showed that deliverance from hades was *peculiar* to the church, and that his affirmation destroyed that peculiarity. Now he says, the wicked are "compelled" to come out, but they do not obtain the victory over hades. Indeed! then hades still holds them; *i. e.*, they come out and they do not come out, because they do not shout when they get out.

We maintain our Lord speaks, Math. 16, of the deliverance of his followers from hades as a victory over hades, and of that *only*. That it is a revival to life eternal is no doubt true; but such as are to live eternally are the only persons that ever do

live from hades, or it would be no peculiarity to be delivered from it; the peculiarity would be in something else, according to Br. H., while our Lord makes it to consist in that, and that alone.

Here it may be proper we should notice our Lord's commission to his disciples, as recorded Mark 16. Jesus rose from the dead. He came out of hades—he was "alive." Some saw him and told others "he was alive," verse 11. They thought it was too much to be believed. Shortly Jesus appeared to the eleven and upbraided them for not believing those who had seen him since he was made alive. Now, saith he, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel"—[*the good news of* LIFE *from the dead*, of which Jesus was "the first fruits,"]—"to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" ["*liveth*"; Syriac: *i. e.*, shall be restored to life as I have been: hades shall not hold him forever;] "but he that believeth not shall be condemned": *i. e.*, "shall not see life"—condemned to live no more forever. Such is the peculiarity of the gospel.—It comes with the good news that Jesus is alive from the dead, and that all who will believe this truth and obey him shall also be made alive from the dead; but those who reject this truth and will not obey him "shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them." Glorious tidings. But how obscured by the doctrine of a future life to all men, whether they obey or not: a life, too, of torment and torture; and in principle it matters not whether that torment be temporary or eternal; it is without hope, and with no design to benefit any one in either case.

We do not admit Br. H.'s hypothesis in section "11." It is too far fetched and overstrained to commend itself to our understanding; but we will not press the point further, at present.

"(12.)" This section is sufficiently answered in our foregoing remarks, except Br. H.'s question to us—"Does he not know the passage means—'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades' to see corruption?" We answer—No: we do not know that to be its meaning; and we are satisfied it is not. Look at it—

"Thou will no leave my soul in hades;

"*Neither* wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."

The first line expresseth the confidence of Messiah that he would not be left in hades. The second line expresses his confidence of an early deliverance from it, and is distinguished from the deliverance itself by the conjunction "neither." Our argument, therefore, is unshaken by Br. H.'s attempt to put it aside; and our "position" is fully "sustained," in our judgment.

"(13.)" So much of our remarks, here referred to by Br. H., as is contained in the following words, we recall, *viz.*, "We believe the wicked dead fall below hades; *i. e.*, they fall into gehenna." This recall saves multiplying words, and this remark was not necessary to our argument. Br. H. means by the expression, "hades yields up," that all men therein are to be made alive; and this, he said, is "contrary to your opinion." We replied, that we believed it "equally contrary to the truth of God's word": and so we still believe, so far as the sense Br. H. affixes to that delivering up is concerned, *viz.*, to be made *alive:* "they are dead, they shall *not live;* they are deceased, they shall not rise"—"they shall not see life"; such is inspired testimony.

"(14.)" The error was in Br. H.'s manuscript.

"(15.)" Br. Hall may be assured he has not "displeased" us, as he seems to think. He is just as dear to our heart to-day as before this controversy commenced. We have ever esteemed him as a beloved brother; and we trust we shall continue to do so still notwithstanding our differences of opinion. We know that we sometimes speak too "positively," and we deeply regret it, and hope we may be able to mend in that matter. The last ten months has been a severe tax on our nervous system. We have not only had Br. Grew, Br. Hall, and Dr. Post on our hands, but some underground workers who have not added to our quietness: so, if we have sometimes not manifested all the meekness we ought, please forgive us. May the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ guide us all with heavenly wisdom, and bring us to his eternal kingdom of glory.

A NEW IDEA FOR THE POPE.—A French ecclesiastic, the Abbé J. H. Michon, has just published a pamphlet of sixty-two pages, entitled *La Papauté à Jerusalem*, (The Papacy at Jerusalem,) and he supports the proposition implied in that title with much good reasoning, and at the same time with the greatest respect for the Holy See. He thinks that, the influence of modern ideas having produced no effect on the Roman administration, the progressive element of the nations has become a formidable enemy to the stationary element of the pontifical government; that the old machine may, it is true, go on, well or ill, so long as it is aided by foreign diplomacy or foreign occupation; but that the moment these are withdraw, the papacy will be exposed, helpless, to revolution, and that the danger is imminent. The solution of that difficult question is not to be found, the Abbé Michon thinks, in political, administrative, or civil reform, nor in secularization of power, which would en-

counter innumerable obstacles in the clerical organization and the prejudices which control the papacy. It is to be found only in the abdication of temporal power. He is *not* of opinion that, in such case, the capital of what may be termed the Spiritual Papacy *could be Rome*. It would lose in dignity, and would still suffer from political complications. He believes that there is but one city which, out of Italy, and, indeed, out of Europe, presents conditions indispensable to its independence and grandeur, and where a new era for the mission of a true apostle would open, *and that city is Jerusalem.—Ch. Adv.*

From John Lindsey, Maine.

Br. Storrs.—I find that the light and knowledge to be gained from the pages of the EXAMINER are a great help in directing my mind towards the subject of eternal life only through Christ: and this is my darling theme—on it I love to contemplate and call to mind the beauties of God's plans connected with it. This is all the joy that I can speak of in this lone meditation of those truths; for it is seldom that I have the pleasure of speaking to one of kindred views. Yet I am stronger in the faith the more I see the falsity of different Protestant theories, and foreign semblance to Divine revelation.

I will repeat what I have written to you before that I thank God that I was permitted ever to hear you preach in Boston; for it was there I heard from your lips teaching that was new to me, and what I could not gainsay, although I had been schooled in Calvinism, and being strenuous on that point of belief—as it is characteristic of that sect so to be—yet I was forced to give up to your arguments. I said I had been strenuous in the belief of Calvinism. I never was at rest in that belief, but after comparing your arguments with the teachings of the Bible I found rest from all doubts; and now I intend to abide by the word of God rather than give heed to man's sayings. In conversing with others I often hear the remark—"Well, you have abundance of Scripture to prove your premises, but can it be that man has not an immortal soul? This has always been preached by men of all sects and popular denominations." Thus, you see, they make no pretence of its being taught by the Bible; but it is the Doctrine of men. Now what saith the Bible in reference to such? "Woe unto you blind guides, who teach for doctrines the commandments of men."

SPIRITUALISM is the angel that John saw "come down from heaven, having great power, and the *earth* was *lightened* with his glory."—*Spir. Telegraph.*

WE admit that the angel spoken of in Rev. xviii. 1, 2, has something to do with Spiritualism; for it is only when great spiritual Babylon, the confused sects of the day, becomes the "hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird," that that angel descends and cries mightily "Babylon is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils." Then will be heard that other voice, which says, "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

There is an agency which is to work with "all power, and signs, and lying wonders," [2 Thess. i: 9; Rev. xiii: 13, 14,] but it comes from anywhere but heaven.—*Review and Herald.*

"MAN'S DESTINY.—Immortality: Arguments from Nature and Scripture. By Rev. T. M. POST, D. D., St. Louis, Mo.; *Reviewed* by GEO. STORRS, Editor of *Bible Examiner*."

The foregoing work is now ready for sale in any quantity that may be desired. *Price* 38 cents per copy; or three copies for $1. In either case we will send free of postage. Five copies will be sent for $1 if the purchaser takes the postage on himself.

We have had a portion of the work bound and lettered: Price, bound, 50 cents. Two copies will be sent free of postage for $1.

OUR visit to Philadelphia and vicinity was protracted to ten days, during which time we spoke publicly five times, and talked much with friends at their houses. We rejoice to find our friends, there, still maintain the principle to "hear, then judge;" and of Christian fellowship on the basis of love to God and His Son, and not on human creeds. May they ever preserve the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free; "growing in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

THE PERFECT WORK.

The mariner home bound,
Though dark the wave,
Is brave,
While storms his barque surround.

The husbandman must wait,
The promise sure,
Endure,
And he shall reap, though late.

Do weary travelers fail,
When home is nigh?
Then why
Not we life's conflict hail?

Time's ocean crost, the signs
Of home appear,
So near,
Shall we our watch resign?

Beside all waters sow,
Though now in tears,
And fears;
The end ye may not know.

To the upright shall rise,
In darkness, light;
Then fight,
'Till thou obtain the prize.

S. BATCHELOR.

THE NEXT EXAMINER will be issued about the middle of September.

fallen, and is become the
Then will be heard that
ys, "Come out of her my
partakers of her sins, and
her plagues."
which is to work with "all
lying wonders," [2 Thess.
4,] but it comes from any-
view and Herald.

-Immortality: Arguments
ure. By Rev. T. M. Post,
Reviewed by Geo. Storrs,
iner."
is now ready for sale in any
desired. *Price* 38 cents
ies for $1. In either case
stage. Five copies will be
haser takes the postage on

ion of the work bound and
d, 50 cents. Two copies
age for $1.

ia and vicinity was protracted
h time we spoke publicly five
ith friends at their houses. We
there, still maintain the princi-
and of Christian fellowship on
ud His Son, and not on human
reserve the liberty wherewith
ee; "growing in grace, and in
and Saviour Jesus Christ."

ECT WORK.

me bound,
rk the wave,
brave,
is barque surround.

n must wait,
se sure,
lure,
ap, though late.

lers fail,
ne is nigh?
en why
onflict hail?

ost, the signs
ppear,
near,
vatch resign?

rs sow,
ow in tears,
d fears;
y not know.

shall rise,
ss, light;
en fight,
in the prize.

S. Batchelor.

ER will be issued about the

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, SEPTEMBER, 1856. NO. 19.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year;

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

LAZARUS IN ABRAHAM'S BOSOM.

BY ELD. Z. CAMPBELL.

Continued from page 142.

It is indeed a great error to consider the Jews under the gospel covenant. There never has been but one covenant made with that people as a people. The Lord made a covenant with Abraham while in uncircumcision, and four hundred and thirty years before the law. This was not a Jewish covenant, for it was long before the Jews existed as a nation, and even before the birth of Judah from whom the term Jew is derived. It was the law which created the national distinction between Jew and Gentile; and it is evident therefore that this distinction cannot exist longer than the life-time of the law; which of itself, was not a means of salvation, for it could not give life; but was added to the Abrahamic economy, as a means of keeping alive the Abrahamic faith, by its ceremonies pointing on to the Lamb of God. And now, since this covenant was made with Abraham while in uncircumcision, it is evidently designed to effect equally all the uncircumcised of all nations of like precious faith; so that it did not relate to the literal seed more than to any others. This should not be confounded with the one made with the literal seed which contained no promise of any thing beyond this life; but the Abrahamic covenant is the only one made with Jew or Gentile, holding in it the promise of future life, future inheritance and kingdom.

Not so with the Sinaic covenant, which was a political thing, made with a nation as a nation, and all the blessings and curses of the nation were made to hang on the obedience or disobedience to it. But obedience to the law, with an understanding of its design, would have kept the people steadfast in the Abrahamic faith. So salvation was "by grace, through faith," even under the law.

But there must be an end to the plan of salvation, through faith: for faith is the confidence of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. But when seen, faith is no longer in exercise.—Salvation *then* must depend on obedience, as before the fall.

We are too apt to forget that God's ways are not like our ways. It seemed impossible to the short sighted Jews that one could be saved without obedience to the law: and so it was during the life-time of the law, and they knew of no probation after the law. And so it seems impossible to the shorter sighted Christians that one can be saved without faith; and so it is under the dispensation of grace, through faith. The apostle tells us, that without faith it is impossible to please God; but he does not tell us it always will be.

Time was when it was impossible to please him without obedience to the law; but now he has no pleasure in them that do keep it.

There is a new covenant to be made with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, "after those days," the days in which the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, &c., the days when the Lord will set his hand the second time to recover the remnant of his people.

This new covenant so frequently referred to by the apostles, is everywhere said to be *in*, or *after*, those days, in *that* day, *at* that time, *in* the day of the Lord, at the gathering of Israel, &c.; terms used to denote the personal reign of Messiah: and to attempt to prove it already made, and in force, is equivalent to an attempt to prove the Messianic reign has already commenced and is now progressing. By consulting Eph. iii: 1 to 6, it will be seen, that no gospel covenant with Gentiles was revealed to the old prophets; but that the gospel to the Gentiles was a mystery, "Which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men."—The new covenant of Jer. xxxi: 31 was made known to the sons of men in former ages, consequently it cannot be the gospel covenant, the mystery which Paul was made a minister of.

Again, the law and the prophets should never be confounded; they are often spoken of together, but never as one. The law was of Sinaic, or Hagarene origin, and gendereth to bondage. But prophecy is of that Jerusalem origin which is above, and free, and the mother of us all. Therefore, the promise, the blessings and the curses under the law, live with the law and die with the law, this side of the world to come. The eyes of the law look no farther ahead than the reign of Messiah. What there is beyond the commencement of that is seen only by the eye of the prophet, and is as unconditional as the ordinances of the sun, moon and stars; and as permanently established as the foundations of the earth. See Jeremiah xxxi: 35, to the end of the chapter.

Care should also be taken not to confound the law and the gospel, nor the people with whom each is made. The law was not given to the Gen-

tiles, as such; nor was the gospel given to the Jews, as such: yet the Gentiles had the privilege, and it was their duty to come in individually under the law: and so the Jews have the privilege, and it is their duty to come in under the gospel. But collectively and nationally, the Jews have nothing more to do with the gospel than the Gentiles had with the law: "they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them."

It is therefore as great an error to attempt to convert the Jews to Gentileism as to attempt to convert Gentiles to Judaism by grafting them into the bosom of Moses. They are two out of Christ, and ever will be; but in Christ they are both one, and that one neither Jew or Gentile; *but one in Christ.*

Now there is no way for Jew or Gentile ever to be saved but by obedience to God. But because the former do not now obey, it does not follow that they never will. It is folly for puny man to set bounds to the mercy of God, saying, he may show mercy to Jews, or Gentiles so far, but no farther. During the law dispensation the Gentiles did not believe, and the Jews thought they never could if they did not do it under the law; but God, more merciful than the Jews, gave them a dispensation beyond the law. So, likewise, God more merciful than the Gentiles, has promised to make a new covenant with the house of Judah and Israel, beyond the gospel age, and to set his hand the second time to restore them. They are the clay which Jeremiah saw the potter to work at on the wheel: the first time he put his hand to it, it was marred in his hand: but he did not throw it away and take another lump; but he took the same lump and made it over again into a vessel that suited him. So the second time the Lord sets his hand to the rebellious house of Israel, he would mould them over again into a vessel that suits him. And this he can and will do without changing his original plan of salvation, which is based on his unbounded mercy and infinite love. Nor is there any fore-ordination or irrevocable decree in all this. Moses prophecied that the children of Israel would depart from the Lord and do evil. There was no condition in the case: it was not *if* they did evil they would sin; nor was there any decree that they *should* sin, whether they would or not, but it was a simple statement of what the Lord foresaw they would do, of their own free-will.

Again by the mouth of Zeph., and other prophets, it is said of his ancient people, Israel and Judah, that they will all call on his name and serve him with one consent. Neither is there a decree that they *shall* serve him whether they will or not; but it is a simple prophecy of what they will yet do of their own accord. The fact is, salvation is, everywhere, in the scriptures, made to hang on obedience to God, and destruction and judgment, on disobedience. So when God says he will destroy or afflict a people or nation, we know they will first become disobedient of their own accord: and when he says he will save or bless a people or nation, we know they will first become obedient of their own accord.

Yet God has promised to turn away threatened judgment on condition of repentance and obedience; and to withhold promised blessings on condition of disobedience, else he would sometimes reward the wicked and destroy the righteous.

But this does not furnish us with the first stone for a foundation for *conditional prophecy*, which, strictly speaking is no prophecy at all: for true prophecy is of some certain event in the future, in the same sense that true history is of some certain event of the past: and so all true prophecy will eventually become history of the past: and there is no possible condition about it more than there is—that the sun rose yesterday, which is past history; and had it been predicted by divine revelation it would have been prophecy, as unconditional as "A virgin shall conceive and bear a son."

If God says he will bring a judgment on a nation or a people with the understanding that they may escape it, and that he will not do it if they repent, it is not a prophecy; but it slides out of the sphere of prophecy into the sphere of promises, threatenings or covenants. The understanding of the conditions is the very thing which distinguishes it from prophecy, from which nothing can be more different; for prophecy is what *will* come to pass; not what *may*, or *may not:* else there is no prophecy in the scripture. Conditional prophecy is, therefore, a twin pseudo to the never-dying soul; they are both traditions of men.

Care should be taken to distinguish between the sure word of prophecy, and what God says he will do to a people with the understanding that he will do or not do as a people are obedient or disobedient.

Nor are the prophecies concerning Israel under any circumstances more conditional than those to the Gentiles. The sure mercies of David are unconditional, or the Gentile has no sure hope.

Had the promised heir to David's throne been on condition of obedience of the rebellious house of Israel, Christ never would have been born, and had it depended on Gentile obedience, he surely never would.

So much for conditional prophecy; a thing of very modern date, invented as a prop to a favorite theory. It is in vain for Gentiles to attempt to fasten a curse on Israel. Balaam tried to curse the literal seed; but he said he could not, because God had blessed them; and as Paul says, concerning things to come. And it is equally as absurd to attempt to force the Almighty to limit the time of their probation to the time of gospel probation. It is not till the fullness of the Gentiles be come in, (the end of gospel probation,) the apostle says, Rom. xi: 25, 26, that "ALL ISRAEL SHALL BE SAVED: as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and he shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." The ungodliness of the Gentile Christian is turned away in being a Christian, and while the gospel is doing its work among the Gentiles: so Jacob cannot be the converts t Christianity, because his ungodliness is to be turned away after the happy state of the Christian is secured. "For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins." Jer. xxxi: 31. So reasons Paul, and he is among the best of commentators: he places the coming of the

Deliverer, and the covenant of Jeremiah at the end of the gospel dispensation.

We come now to speak of the two people, Jews and Gentiles, in relation to the two covenants, the Abrahamic and the *new covenant* of Jeremiah.—And first, it must be borne in mind that a covenant is an agreement between parties; and that one party cannot make a covenant. The Jews agreed to do all that God commanded them by the mouth of Moses: Ex. xix: 8, and xxiv: 3–7; but they never agreed to do anything which Christ commanded them; therefore, the Lord, through Moses, made a covenant with them, but Christ did not. This has an important bearing on the new covenant of Jeremiah, in which the Jews have never yet been a party; nor can they be "until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in": and if it could be proved that Christ offered it to them, as he did the gospel, it would be the best proof that it was not *made with them;* because they despised both it and him, and between him and them there was no agreement, consequently no covenant.

We have shown that the Jew died with his law, and was buried at the time the Gentile was carried to Abraham's bosom, and that he still continues to "have Moses and the prophets," and whenever he will hear *them*, he will live again, and come up out of his grave and be planted in the land promised to Jacob. Ezek. xxxvii. His present condition is not a living one; his next living is under the new covenant of Jeremiah, which cannot hang on any conditions of any people; for in this particular case, God has given his own conditions on which he will fulfil his promise to the house of Jacob and to the house of Judah. See Jer. xxxi: 35–37. The Lord himself has nailed this covenant to the ordinances of the sun, moon and stars, and to the foundations of the earth; and we have no right to invent a condition and crowd it in here to crowd out the one the Lord himself has given.

Now whether there are future blessings or curses for Israel or not, does not depend at all on the conditions of the obsolete law, but on an independent train of prophecy. This declares that Israel will turn to the Lord and serve him with one consent: and be saved with an everlasting salvation. Zeph. iii: 9, and Isa. xlv: 17.

The Sinaic covenant is of no force under the reign of Messiah, where the weal or wo of Israel depends on whether he obeys him or not. The prophets say he will, and David says, "All the kings of the earth shall praise thee, O Lord, when they hear the words of thy mouth."

Having shown that the new covenant of Jeremiah is not yet made with Israel and Judah, we will next show that the gospel covenant cannot be made with any nation as a nation; for it is, in all its essential elements the Abrahamic covenant of grace, through faith, and cannot be established by law, or at all regulated by legislation, like the Mosaic covenant which was enforced by Jewish legislation. The folly of men for thirteen hundred years, in attempting to establish religion by law has proved unavailing to make men embrace the Abrahamic faith, and in the wisdom of God it was never designed to. But Jewish legislation did make men Jews by enforcing the observance of "THE *Law*," but even this failed to keep them in the Abrahamic faith. Therefore, no *covenant*, *mode* or *system of faith*, can be made with a nation as such; but must be left to commend itself to the consciences of individuals.

The Sinaic covenant was therefore the only covenant ever made between God and a nation, and while the Jews were under it they were his people: Deut. xxix: 12–13; but the Gentiles, before the introduction of the gospel, were not a people: Deut. xxxii: 21; Rom. x: 19, but coming under the gospel covenant made them a people: 1 Pet. ii: 9. "But ye (believing Gentiles) are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, which in times past were not a people, but are now the people of God."

We are now prenared to demonstrate the fact and settle the question once for all, that the new covenant of Jer. xxxi: 31, has not yet been made with Israel. And first, it has been shown that under the law, the Jews were a people by virtue of the Sinaic covenant, and the Gentiles, at the same time, were no people; but by virtue of the gospel covenant which they are now under, as individuals, they *are* a people, while the Jews, in unbelief, as they are, are not a people. And secondly, since the Gentiles, coming under the gospel, become a people; the Jews, if under it, would also be a people: but as they are not *now* a people, they are not under the gospel. And finally, it is through faith on the Son of God by which alone the Gentiles come under the gospel, and become the people of God: so the Jews, in unbelief, cannot be under the gospel, nor can they be the people of God, as the Gentiles were not before *they* believed. It is still further certain that the new covenant is not made with Israel and Judah, for one of the stipulations of it is—"I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." By virtue of the new covenant, they become the people of God, and as they are not now a people, they are not now under the new covenant.

We admit that here and there a Jew has believed on the Lord Jesus, and has been incorporated with the people of God; but these isolated cases have no general bearing on the subject.—This principle of exegesis will not do, though often resorted to to serve a by-end, while the same principle would be revolting in other cases; for instance, Daniel says—"But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever. Now if only here and there one of the saints possess the kingdom, the word will be broken. In like manner the new covenant will be made "with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, or the word will be broken; and it must be "After those days," and not before them.

The two houses, as a whole, are broken off through unbelief, but not forever. This is represented in the first chapter of Hosea, in the son of Gomer, the daughter of Diblaim—"Then said God—Call his name Lo-ammi: for ye are not my people, and I will not be your God. Yet the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea—and

Deliverer, and the covenant of Jeremiah at the end of the gospel dispensation.

We come now to speak of the two people, Jews and Gentiles, in relation to the two covenants, the Abrahamic and the *new covenant* of Jeremiah.—And first, it must be borne in mind that a covenant is an agreement between parties; and that one party cannot make a covenant. The Jews agreed to do all that God commanded them by the mouth of Moses: Ex. xix: 8, and xxiv: 3–7; but they never agreed to do anything which Christ commanded them; therefore, the Lord, through Moses, made a covenant with them, but Christ did not. This has an important bearing on the new covenant of Jeremiah, in which the Jews have never yet been a party; nor can they be "until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in": and if it could be proved that Christ offered it to them, as he did the gospel, it would be the best proof that it was not *made with them;* because they despised both it and him, and between him and them there was no agreement, consequently no covenant.

We have shown that the Jew died with his law, and was buried at the time the Gentile was carried to Abraham's bosom, and that he still continues to "have Moses and the prophets," and whenever he will hear *them*, he will live again, and come up out of his grave and be planted in the land promised to Jacob. Ezek. xxxvii. His present condition is not a living one; his next living is under the new covenant of Jeremiah, which cannot hang on any conditions of any people; for in this particular case, God has given his own conditions on which he will fulfil his promise to the house of Jacob and to the house of Judah. See Jer. xxxi: 35–37. The Lord himself has nailed this covenant to the ordinances of the sun, moon and stars, and to the foundations of the earth; and we have no right to invent a condition and crowd it in here to crowd out the one the Lord himself has given.

Now whether there are future blessings or curses for Israel or not, does not depend at all on the conditions of the obsolete law, but on an independent train of prophecy. This declares that Israel will turn to the Lord and serve him with one consent: and be saved with an everlasting salvation. Zeph. iii: 9, and Isa. xlv: 17.

The Sinaic covenant is of no force under the reign of Messiah, where the weal or wo of Israel depends on whether he obeys him or not. The prophets say he will, and David says, "All the kings of the earth shall praise thee, O Lord, when they hear the words of thy mouth."

Having shown that the new covenant of Jeremiah is not yet made with Israel and Judah, we will next show that the gospel covenant cannot be made with any nation as a nation; for it is, in all its essential elements the Abrahamic covenant of grace, through faith, and cannot be established by law, or at all regulated by legislation, like the Mosaic covenant which was enforced by Jewish legislation. The folly of men for thirteen hundred years, in attempting to establish religion by law has proved unavailing to make men embrace the Abrahamic faith, and in the wisdom of God it was never designed to. But Jewish legislation did make men Jews by enforcing the observance of "THE *Law*," but even this failed to keep them in the Abrahamic faith. Therefore, no *covenant*, *mode* or *system of faith*, can be made with a nation as such; but must be left to commend itself to the consciences of individuals.

The Sinaic covenant was therefore the only covenant ever made between God and a nation, and while the Jews were under it they were his people: Deut. xxix: 12–13; but the Gentiles, before the introduction of the gospel, were not a people: Deut. xxxii: 21; Rom. x: 19, but coming under the gospel covenant made them a people: 1 Pet. ii: 9. "But ye (believing Gentiles) are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, which in times past were not a people, but are now the people of God."

We are now prenared to demonstrate the fact and settle the question once for all, that the new covenant of Jer. xxxi: 31, has not yet been made with Israel. And first, it has been shown that under the law, the Jews were a people by virtue of the Sinaic covenant, and the Gentiles, at the same time, were no people; but by virtue of the gospel covenant which they are now under, as individuals, they *are* a people, while the Jews, in unbelief, as they are, are not a people. And secondly, since the Gentiles, coming under the gospel, become a people; the Jews, if under it, would also be a people: but as they are not *now* a people, they are not under the gospel. And finally, it is through faith on the Son of God by which alone the Gentiles come under the gospel, and become the people of God: so the Jews, in unbelief, cannot be under the gospel, nor can they be the people of God, as the Gentiles were not before *they* believed. It is still further certain that the new covenant is not made with Israel and Judah, for one of the stipulations of it is—"I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." By virtue of the new covenant, they become the people of God, and as they are not now a people, they are not now under the new covenant.

We admit that here and there a Jew has believed on the Lord Jesus, and has been incorporated with the people of God; but these isolated cases have no general bearing on the subject.—This principle of exegesis will not do, though often resorted to to serve a by-end, while the same principle would be revolting in other cases; for instance, Daniel says—"But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever. Now if only here and there one of the saints possess the kingdom, the word will be broken. In like manner the new covenant will be made "with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, or the word will be broken; and it must be "After those days," and not before them.

The two houses, as a whole, are broken off through unbelief, but not forever. This is represented in the first chapter of Hosea, in the son of Gomer, the daughter of Diblaim—"Then said God—Call his name Lo-ammi: for ye are not my people, and I will not be your God. Yet the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea—and

it shall come to pass that in the place where it was said unto them, ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, ye are the sons of the living God. Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head (Ezek. xxxvii : 24–26,) and they shall come up out of the land : for great shall be the day of Jezreel."

The time of their being the people of God is fixed at the time the two houses, Israel and Judah, are gathered together, "one king being over them all." They are Lo-ammi now ; but with divine assurance that they will yet be gathered together, and appoint unto themselves one head, and become the sons of the living God : and Jeremiah puts this down under the new covenant,

Now there is no promise that God will ever make a new covenant with Abraham's seed by faith. There is no need of that seed having a new one ; for the old one, made with Abraham, is faultless, it genders to life, and is the embodiment of the Christian's hope, and everything desirable in the future. But not so with the Sinaic covenant, the first one with Israel and Judah : that was faulty, it could not give life, but gendered to bondage ; consequently a place was sought for the second, or new one ; and—"In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away." The one here called *old*, is the faulty one, and therefore could not relate to the one made with Abraham.

Here lies the great and prevalent error. The Gentiles adopting the Abrahamic faith, as shown by Lazarus being carried by angels to Abraham's bosom, is too often taken for a new covenant ; but it is nowhere so called in the scriptures ; nor was it new in any sense of the word, but was actually four hundred and thirty years older than the first one made with Israel and Judah. So the gospel, instead of being anything new under the sun, was preached to Abraham more than two thousand years before Christ.

The objection, sometimes raised against the new covenant being future, because it would necessarily require that Christ should die again, has no force in it. Paul to the Hebrews, went on to show them the two orders of priesthood, the Aaronic, and the Melchizedec. He showed them that their Aaronic high priest offered blood once a year, and it was necessary that this man (Christ) should have something to offer : but this signified that the way into the holiest of all was not made manifest, and not that he should offer himself often, but *once* in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. So to make it necessary for him to die again at the introduction of the new covenant, would make him a high priest of the Aaronic order, and subvert the whole argument of Paul, who gives for a reason why he does not die often, that he is not a high priest of the Aaronic order.

The circumstance that he is the mediator of a better covenant, does not prove that covenant was introduced at the first advent, more than the circumstance that he is heir to David's throne proves that he is now reigning on it. Nor does the circumstance that a covenant or testament is of force after the death of the testator, avail anything in this argument : for Paul shows us that one offering of the Melchisedec high priest is sufficient in all cases. And we know that by virtue of the Abrahamic covenant, men were saved before the death of the testator, else Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets are lost.

WANDERING THOUGHTS.

The existence of "Wandering Thoughts," as they are popularly designated, constitutes one striking feature in the action of mind, which it is useful to understand, for our own satisfaction, as well as for the comfort of others. There is a confessed tendency in the mind to wander from the subject of meditation,—a tendency especially observed by *pious* men, during their hallowed exercises. They feel their minds liable to shift to another topic, or, in other words, foreign ideas thrust themselves on their notice, and the contrast between these and the selected topics of reflection, along with an exemplary fear of sin, attracts the attention, and excites many painful emotions.

The leading and distinguishing characteristic element in these ideas is, they are *involuntary*.—The result of self-reflection is, they come unsought, and in many cases remain unasked, at least when no conscious effort is made to retain them. Were the mind only capable of voluntary thought, it might wander just as we know it does, still it then would be intentional aberration, and not such as is experienced and lamented in its present constitution and mode of action. So far are these specific thoughts from being intentionally conceived, that the complaint is, they spring into being independent of the will, and, for a time, cannot be ejected or forgotten. If the will had full authority over them, they would never be admitted, or rather, considering our ignorance of the next idea that will appear, we should affirm, their entrance and exit would be almost simultaneous.

Now, it may be said, are not the greater number of thoughts involuntary ? Yes, we admit they are. When walking abroad, or musing at home, the mind generally receives silent permission to roam where it pleases ; we have formed no purpose to think on any particular subject, and, of course, are in our thoughts entirely guided by association, or ideas excited by present sensations. In these circumstances, we are not, however, irresponsible, nor are we free from danger ; the thoughts may be foolish, absurd,—they may be even positively sinful. They have undoubtedly entered the mind not by express command, so to speak, but we have permitted the mind to enter into circumstances where they have been formed or suggested, which could certainly have been avoided. Might we not, for example, have restrained ourselves, and directed our faculties to useful, at least innocent subjects, or immediately have withdrawn them from vain and criminal contemplations ? If, in the course of these lawless excursions, evil passions and desires happen to be kindled, by their objects being painted on the imagination, it is demonstrably certain,

that we are accountable for their present activity, and every item of resulting conduct.

Wandering thoughts, *directly so called*, are quite of a different character, as they enter in totally different circumstances; they occur, not when the mind is luxuriating at ease, on the contrary, they come when it is actively engaged;—not when efforts are employed to avoid them, but when there is a resolution to have all the faculties and emotions absorbed, if possible, by one theme; not merely when it is purposely occupied with moral and religious subjects, but on any one that may engage our attention.

To cast some light on this perplexing subject, let us, in the meantime, consider the *spontaneous action* of the mental faculties and emotions.

The human mind has not unfrequently been compared to an engine, over which we have perfect control, with more apparent than real truth and propriety. No doubt, we can set the mind agoing, in other words, choose to think on any particular subject, but we are conscious that it often begins of its own accord, and that we can seldom or never bring it to rest when we please. Certain feelings unexpectedly come into existence, certain faculties start into action, we cannot tell how or why; and instantly to subdue these emotions, or change the topic of thought, is completely beyond our power. Let the occasion be the most solemn, these internal movements, nevertheless, take place, and we are compelled to attend to them, even though at the expense, for a time, of nobler thoughts and feelings. Were we to consult general experience, we would soon find ample and curious illustration of this singular fact in our constitution. The predominant faculty and passion would, in all likelihood, be most commonly specific, as furnishing examples of involuntary action. On a sudden, the mind was filled with a craving for music, and strange notes were heard within—or for calculation, and figures entered, forthwith, into the various combinations—or places, long since visited came back in all their orignal freshness—or scenes of surpassing loveliness and grandeur were wrought by the imagination—or fantastic and ludicrous exhibitions presented themselves, causing a momentary irrepressible smile to play on the countenance—or some passion arose in all its energy and absorbed the thinking powers, and obliged them for a while to minister to its existence and gratification. We are persuaded these experiences are more common than is generally supposed, or perhaps admitted, and it is high time they should be openly and frankly confessed.—They will be more common, especially with those who are of a nervous and sanguine temperament, these being most subject to mental activity and excitement.

A very singular and striking example of the unwilled activity of the faculties, is seen in the phenomena of dreaming. During the hours of sleep, it frequently happens that thoughts and emotions are vividly excited—thoughts solid and futile, serious and comical, emotions fierce and revengeful, gentle and compassionate. Who has not had such recollections, as he awoke to consciousness during the watches of the night, or at the morning dawn? Need we bring back to any the reminiscences of those days, when they lay in the burning arms of a fever, and scenes and sounds horrible beyond description, occupied, oppressed, nay, even tortured their faculties.

Such are a few instances of spontaneous or unwilled activity; but how they take place, is a dificult inquiry. Sometimes the associating principle may furnish an explanation, but not always. There seems to be some unknown influence of the blood, perhaps also some unknown electric influence, upon the brain, exciting a part, and leaving the rest of that vital organ in a quiescent state. That, at least, both the quantity, quality, and rate of motion in the blood, has an influence on the mind, is a truth fast gaining upon public conviction. Let us glance at some of its more prominent effects.—Fainting, that image of death, is occasioned, at any rate attended, by the descent of the blood from the brain, when thought and consciousness cease till it returns. The use of powerful stimulants is well known not merely to excite the sentiments and propensities of our common nature, but to give an impulse, and often a wonderful elevation, to thought and imagination, as when opium is employed. During these moments, the pulse beats with increased speed, and, of course, the blood is propelled through the body with unusual velocity. Moreover, the very act of voluntary thinking and feeling, causes it, in an augmented stream, to enter the brain; for parts of this organ have been seen to expand and subside, with the commencement and cessation of thought and emotion. From these facts, we gather evidence, that the mind by night and by day is often forced, by some internal influence, into the different states of which we know it to be susceptible. Whether it is by the blood that these involuntary movements are produced, it may be difficult exactly to determine, though there is great probability that in the majority of instances, it is the existing physical cause, account for the facts as you may, their existence cannot be denied, and every one can judge, if ever, how often, and in what forms they are presented to himself.

When these spontaneous movements take place, the thoughts will wander, or leave the topic of present meditation. It may be solemn and awfully momentous, but from it we are imperiously attracted, and some time may elapse before we can renew former contemplations. These revolutions will occur in spite of every exertion we vainly employ to the contrary.

THE CHRISTIAN RACE.

"*Looking unto Jesus.*"—HEB. XII: 1–13.

Under the similitude of men running in a race we are here advised by the apostle Paul to lay aside every weight, or encumbrance, and the sin which does so easily beset us, to run with patience, "Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith." This common sense advice is given also by Peter (1st Epist. i: 13,) "Gird up the loins of your mind, and hope to the end." We run for *life*, and we should run unencumbered.

The sin which most easily besets us,—the parent

sin it may be called,—is that ever-recurring desire to do our own will rather than the will of God.—We know that our own ways are not as God's ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts, yet, in despite of this conviction, and it may be of experience also, we are constantly beset with this sin, springing not so much from obstinacy as from pride, ignorance, or self-sufficiency. It is *natural* to like our own way; but this way, unless it is also God's—which can be learned chiefly from his word—is sure to lead us into evil. Self-conceit has the effect of obscuring the designs of God, and rendering us oblivious both of his promises and threatenings: it weakens us for his service, so that we run without spirit: it is, moreover, subversive of that faith by which we have "fled away from the corruption that is in the world." (2 Pet. 1–4.) As seekers after immortality we must, then, have no will but God's will.

"Lay aside every weight." One heavy clog upon our movements consists of the cares and anxieties of life, and one pressing form of these is the necessity of providing for the future wants of ourselves and families. Well as we know theoretically, and perhaps experimentally, that God is the preserver of his people, and that he is always at hand, so that we need be careful for nothing, yet will a natural instinct, or distrust of God, or perhaps custom and bad example, draw us aside after what the world calls the "main chance"—in other words, *mammon*. Somehow or other we contrive, like Martha, to be careful and troubled about many things. We see daily proofs of the truth of the Lord's saying, "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light," and we should endeavor to imitate these wise ones so far as to strive with our whole soul and strength, in order to the attainment of the "true riches," which we profess to seek after. Not that it is wrong to have a little forethought and provide for one's own; but an over-anxiety and carefulness, a half repressed wish and thought, that all things around us shall remain stable and secure, tend grievously to confine our energies to this perishing state, and constitute the "weight" which we are to cast aside. They create doubts in the mind, which, like exhalations, render our way obscure, and hide from our eyes the "sun of righteousness," to whom we should look.

Another weight, which impedes us in our course, is the undue indulgence of our appetites,—that is, excess in eating, drinking, slumbering. This weight adjusts itself so nicely to our natural strength that we are scarcely conscious of its existence. But we all carry it, more or less. The indulgence of these appetites tend to foster a dull sluggish habit of body and mind, whereby our energies are cramped, our conceptions are rendered poor and fruitless, and the hope set before us is obscured. By intemperance in any shape, the thoughts are forced into a worldly, fleshly channel; soon the inert spirit finds pleasure in the ignoble ease of captivity—captivity to sin! Temperance in all things best preserves the vigor of the man, and will help to keep him in the best possible condition for hearing and understanding what is the will of God. "He who striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things." (1 Cor. ix: 25.)

We are also fearfully obstructed in our Christian course by the improper exercise of our passions. He is strong who has them under due control: "he who has no rule over his spirit is like a city without bars or gates." As for the man "who is hasty in his spirit," the melancholy truth appears on the page of Scripture, "there is more hope of a fool than of him." What self-condemnation! What misery! What remorse! do many suffer through yielding to envy, anger, or malice. What burning blushes of shame will mantle the cheek of many, when they bring to recollection some past actions of their history, when their passions led sober reason captive. If it were possible, would they not restore, at almost any price, the time now gone forever, that their course might be amended? The indulgence of the passions darkens and perplexes a man's way, and too often leaves him in such a position that he must either renounce the hope of immortality, or recommence the Christian race with diminished strength and hope. O what tyrants these passions become!—Is the reader one of their slaves?

There is yet another weight—a burdensome one no doubt—one, however, that must be laid aside. It is this:—Impatience at the vexations we meet with at every turn in this changeful world; or rather, it is a want of due submission to the divine operations and oversight. Could we get rid of this weight, we would esteem others light in comparison and easily parted with. But we must lay it aside and become patient, watchful and prayerful. Patience and perseverance are twin sisters. It is here that Paul, after having cited a cloud of witnesses, who were all eminent examples of suffering patience, quits the line of direct precept and points to Jesus; Heb. xii: 1. He says, verse, 3, "Consider him who endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds." He tells them, moreover, that their troubles are intended as chastisements, and are proofs of the love of their heavenly Father. Now, as we know that "all things work together for good to those who love God," it will be our wisdom to look upon such things as cause grief and vexation—which tend to abate our pride and self love,—to expose our ignorance to our own eyes—as being only the gentle and merciful dealings of our great Parent. "No chastisement for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward, it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them that are exercised thereby," verse 11. If, then, we should be visited with the undeserved scorn or ridicule of our fellows, or with the loss of worldly goods; if sickness should attack and waste our frames, making us desire death rather than life; if through calumny old friends turn cold and forsake us; or if beloved relatives are untimely removed from our side;—if any events such as these do come upon us, undoubtedly we must grieve; not to do so would indicate an unnatural and unamiable disposition, alien from the spirit of Christ, who wept over both the griefs and the follies of men; but we ought to learn cheerful submission

to God's pleasure and arrangements, trusting that, with infinite wisdom and goodness, he knows better than ourselves what is good and profitable for us. He was a shrewd observer who made the road to heaven pass through the valley of humiliation.

If the trials and crosses of this life are received —as they too often are—in a repining spirit, as if we were hardly used, then, indeed, our discontent and impatience as before stated, become a weight, threatening to stop us entirely in our onward progress. We must consider, *first*, that we are chastised in measure, as medicine is very carefully dealt out by a skilful physician; and, *secondly*, that we are so constituted, that affliction has a direct tendency to bring into exercise the virtues which most adorn the doctrine of Christ, and make man pleasing to God—namely, patience, perseverance, hope, joy, peace, confidence, and love.—There are few of our readers, probably, but can call to mind some illustration of the wholesome effects of this divine discipline, and can bear witness that out of deep suffering and sorrow there has been brought forth the quickly sympathizing spirit, ever seeking to pour into the wounded breast the wine and oil of consolation. And of such we may affirm, the spirit has been tamed and taught by adversity—rendered sensibly alive to the claims of all who stand in need of its ministrations.

In a cheerful submission to the events of God's providence, and in a patient endurance of all that his chastening and fatherly hand may inflict upon us, Jesus, the only begotten of the Father, is our exemplar. "Looking unto Jesus" will bear us up and on in every trial.

As the Captain of our Salvation, it was necessary that he should be perfected in the school of obedience; Heb. x: 7. Hence he passed through the deep waters of affliction. He became a scoff and a jest! Brutal and unfeeling men surrounded and mocked him. As it is written, "They compassed me about with words of hatred, and fought against me without a cause. For my love they are mine enemies. I am poor and needy, and my heart is wounded within me: my knees are weak through fasting, and my flesh faileth of fatness. I became also a reproach unto them." Ps. cix: 2, 4, 22, 25: "Reproach hath broken my heart." lxix: 20. Jesus bore unmurmuringly a mighty load of grief, keeping in view "the joy that was set before him;" to attain which joy, and that he might be fitted for his Headship, he was subjected to this trying ordeal. S. R. M.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive?

The following remarks on the above subject are in a private letter to us, and the writer did not intend them for the public; but there is so much that is deeply interesting to our mind, and worthy to be pondered that he must excuse us for letting others see an extract from his letter; but we will withhold his name. He says:

"There is one leading objection which presents itself to every one, and that must be obviated, if it can be, before you can bring a certain class to look at the subject with attention. I refer to the objection that the doctrine in question supersedes all idea of a retribution. I do not bring this forward as a formidable obstacle in my own mind, for I have my views of the matter; but it is the argument which does trouble most minds, and one the honest enquirers do not seem able to get over.

One reason why I wish to see the subject taken up is that, I do not think the death of Christ is correctly understood. I do not know that I can give you, on paper, a definite idea of my difficulty, but I am satisfied the common view of that subject is not what the word of God presents to us. If *death* entered and passed upon mankind in the first Adam, then *Life* must come in the second? If the disobedience of the first brings *death:* then the obedience of the second (obedience unto death) brings *life*. But *how* can this be done, and mankind be left free agents? I answer, (and I can see no other consistent solution) that the disobedience of the first Adam was the *acting out of a frail nature*, and was a perfect trial, in the person of the first pair, of that nature. Man was *proved, in the mass*, by a single experiment, and the matter was settled—he could not stand the trial *in the flesh*. Well, man *in the flesh*, is condemned; and in the person of the second Adam, we have the human and the Divine united, and in that shape obedience has been rendered to the demands of the law, and a *principle* manifested which every true believer possesses, by his very divine relation. This principle of obedience in Christ is *essentially* in all his people; and what *he done they have the heart to do*—bow submissively to the mind and will of God. What is this, but pure and implicit *faith?* Did the first Adam show more than a *want* of faith? And did Adam the second do more than exhibit that grace *in its perfection?* Now *why* are the wicked to be destroyed. It seems to me, it is because they are good for nothing, and can do nothing in the government of God.—If they would see themselves as helpless and worthless, and apply to Christ for a new nature, he would impart to them his life-giving Spirit, and *then* they would be "raised up at the last day."

Perhaps you may get my idea, and if it is correct then there is really no need of a retribution in the world to come. The soul that sinneth, *dies*.

WASTED TIME.—Coming hastily into a chamber, I had almost thrown down a crystal hour-glass. Fear, lest I had, made me grieve as if I had broken it. But alas, how much precious time have I cast away without any regret! the hour-glass was but crystal, each hour a pearl; that but like to be broken, this lost outright: that but casually, this done wilfully. A better hour-glass might be bought; but time lost once, lost ever. Thus we grieve more for toys than for treasure. Lord, give me an hour-glass, not to be by me, but to be in me. Teach me to number my days. An hour-glass to turn *me*, that I may apply my heart unto wisdom.—*Dr. T. Fuller.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, September, 1856.

THE POPE GOING TO JERUSALEM.

We gave some time since an account of a recent French papal book, in favor of the transfer of the papacy to Jerusalem. The proposition looks like a phantasy, but the *New York Observer* says that "it is now declared that this question has already been most seriously examined; even so far back as the time when the bishops met to determine on the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, a large number of the members, and Pius IX. himself, were favorable to the project. A person, whose opinion is relied upon, adds that he will soon give more substantial reasons for the 'translation of the Holy See to the cradle of Jesus Christ.' He forgets to say rather, 'which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified.' What light would such an event throw upon prophecy? and how many apparent disagreeing points would it reconcile?"

It would be a happy idea to shut the pope up in Jerusalem. Popery is out of date, and it might well be left to sleep or snore in the Orient; but we doubt the hope.

The foregoing we cut from the *Christian Advocate* of this city, Aug. 28th. We gave a short item on the same subject, from the same paper, in our last. The *Advocate* treats the subject very lightly, as the concluding remark shows; but the quotation from the *New York Observer* struck our mind entirely different from what seems to have been the feeling of the *Advocate*. We are persuaded *if* popery goes to Jerusalem it is not to be "shut up" there. Truly did the *Observer* say, Jerusalem, "which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified." But what does the prophecy, from which the *Observer* quotes, say is to happen at the end of the "thousand two hundred and three score days" that God's "two witnesses" are to "prophecy clothed in sackcloth"? In that city "spiritually called Sodom," &c., those witnesses are to be *slain*, by "the beast that cometh up out of the bottomless pit"; he "shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them: and their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom," &c.

Will the *Observer* or *Advocate* please tell us, whether, in their opinion, this prophecy has ever been fulfilled? and if not, may not the removal of the Popedom to Jerusalem be the first act in the drama towards its accomplishment? May it not be true, that the final contest between corrupt and pure Christianity is to be witnessed at Jerusalem, "where our Lord was crucified"! And may it not be a fact, that the corrupt is to have a fearful triumph there, by the help of "the beast," using his sword to overcome and slay God's two witnesses? so that, for a short time, there shall be rejoicing among "the people and kindreds and tongues and nations" over the witnesses of God, "slain"? We affirm nothing on the subject; but we confess, that the idea of "the translation of the Holy See" to Jerusalem is, to us, the most startling announcement; and if carried out, we think it will open up a page in prophecy that will make even the ears of the *Advocate* tingle. We shall watch the prospect of such a movement with very different feelings than those which seem to be in the bosom of the *Advocate* or *Observer*. Jerusalem has been trodden down by a "*daily*," or continual, desolator for twelve hundred years or more. Is that desolator now to be "taken away," and in its stead "the abomination that astonisheth set up"? see Dan. 12: 11; and compare it with Rev. 11.

"What I say unto you, I say unto all—*watch*." Thus spake Jesus, Mark 13: 37; and we shall all do well to heed the warning.

"Wisdom Shall Die With You."

A friend writing us from the west says—"In talking with a stiff *Oberlinite* he said, 'The immortality of the soul is not questioned in the Bible, but is an assented fact that needs no proof.'" Our friend adds—"Such reasoning had no convincing effect on me."

It is not the first time the advocates of error have hid their nakedness with "fig-leaves." When men attempt to satisfy inquiring minds by such a baseless *assumption* it is proof positive they have built their faith on the sand. Archbishop WHATELY says—

"To believe as others believe, is a compendious creed, taxing neither a man's intellect, nor his industry;—a creed resulting from the indolence—the spiritual carelessness,—the weakness and the dishonest ambition of human nature."

But such, alas, is the "creed" of most men on theological questions. Prof. FINNEY, of the Oberlin Institute, preached a sermon, several years since, on "The Loss when a Soul is Lost." At the outset he "assumed" that "the soul is immortal;" and told his hearers—"You admit that the Bible teaches this, and I shall not therefore attempt to prove it."

A minister from that theological school, not many months since, said, in one of his "revival" sermons,

—"The damned in hell would offer up a prayer that they might be *annihiluted*: but for God to comply with their desire would be showing mercy; therefore, he would not, or could not do it."

We suppose, as he offered no proof of his fraud on common sense, that his "creed" was "to believe as" Prof. Finney "believes:" and the "Oberlinite," of whom our friend writes us, it seems, has the same *creed*. It is easy to learn, for it "taxes no man's industry or intellect;" he needs no *searching the* "Scriptures;" that tiresome work he can leave to such "fools" as believe Jesus really meant what he said, and who believe no *proxy* faith will pass for true coin with the "Searcher of hearts." Woe to the "dishonest ambition of human nature" which would encourage men to receive for truth any doctrine which arises not from personal searching the scriptures, unbiased by any human authority. The Bible commands no man's faith to an *assumption;* it forbids us to let our "faith stand in the wisdom of men:" and Jesus declared—"If I had not come and spoken unto them they had not had sin;" and "if I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin." It is no sin to reject any man's assumptions; but the testimony which God gives us must be our guide in all matters of faith. Not what any man or body of men pronounce that testimony to be, but that which comes to us with a "*Thus saith the* LORD." Now we challenge all the theological world to produce one text in the Bible that saith, "man hath an immortal soul;" or, that "the soul is immortal." There is no such utterance there. And the Bible never demands faith in anything without "proof." To say, therefore, that, "The immortality of the soul is an assented fact, in the Bible, that needs no proof," is to utter an untruth: and demonstrates the utterer to be destitute of any Bible proof of his position: it is an unwilling acknowledgment that he has *no proof* in the Bible for his assumption.

LIFE FROM THE DEAD:
Or, The Righteous Only will Live Again.

Since the issue of the last EXAMINER we have applied ourself diligently in writing and arranging the Work suggested by Dr. HUNTINGTON, on the non-living again of the wicked dead. We have endeavored to condense and simplify the subject as far as possible. The reader will find much that is new inserted, while he will recognise some of the old arguments which have been presented in the EXAMINER. We have thus endeavored to bring "forth out of the treasury things new and old," and to place them before the mind in a way that the value and importance of the subject can be seen without the confusion of a protracted discussion. All the prominent texts relied on by the adverse theory are taken up and examined as briefly as could be done consistently.

The work will make from 75 to 100 pages of the same size as the Review of Dr. Post; but unless we have aid, by way of funds, we dare not venture on its publication. If any friends are disposed to furnish the means, we will issue it immediately after our return from the west.

The work will be entitled "LIFE FROM THE DEAD: or *The Righteous only will Live again.*" About $160 will be needed to issue it without embarrassing us: but each person contributing towards that sum shall have refunded to him the amount of his contribution at the wholesale price as soon as it is issued, if he desires it. Please state definitely on this point, when money is sent us, what your wish is.

VISIT TO MICHIGAN.—We expect to commence a course of Lectures at *Reading Village*, Mich., near Hillsdale, Thursday evening, Sept. 18th, to continue about one week. After that spend two or three days in *Hillsdale*, lecturing there till after Sunday the 28th inst.

We do not design to go farther west, but shall return east, or visit some places in Ohio, before we come back to New York.

If any friends wish to communicate with us, while in Michigan, please direct to *Hillsdale*, care of A. N. SEYMOUR.

We may be absent from New York some four weeks; but we shall arrange to have orders for Books attended to during that time.

"MAN'S DESTINY.—Immortality: Arguments from Nature and Scripture, by Rev. T. M. POST, D. D., St. Louis, Mo.; *Reviewed* by GEO. STORRS, Editor of *Bible Examiner*."

The foregoing work is now ready for sale in any quantity that may be desired. *Price* 38 cents per copy; or three copies for $1. In either case we will send free of postage. Five copies will be sent for $1 if the purchaser takes the postage on himself.

We have had a portion of the work bound and lettered: Price, bound, 50 cents. Two copies will be sent free of postage for $1.

Any of our paying subscribers who have not received a copy of the foregoing work should inform us without delay. We sent to all when the work was issued; but a few, we have learned, did not receive it: we have sent to such again.

Reply No. 3 to Macknight, Jr.

BY HENRY GREW.

I deem it necessary to reply but briefly to our brother's last article. I humbly consider the plain and positive testimony of Jesus Christ and his apostle, that "they that have done evil" "shall hear his voice and shall come forth unto the resurrection of *condemnation*," and that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the *unjust*," to outweigh volumes of such reasoning on Luke 20 : 37, 38, as our ingenious friend has presented us.

He will permit me however, to ask him to review the manner in which he has endeavored "to expose" the "fallacy" of my argumentation and affirmations. He has, for this purpose, made three assertions without proof of their verity; the incorrectness of each I shall endeavor to show.

1. He remarks, "If (in keeping with Br. G.'s position) the *common* relationship secures the revival of all men from the dead, it must secure 'the resurrection of life' mentioned in John 5 : 29—in which case the peculiar relationship, being unnecessary, could not exist." I ask, *why* must it? I deny this necessity, and affirm that, for the purpose of righteous judgment, God may raise the wicked to *temporary* and not *eternal* life as John 5 : 29 imports.

2. "Any relationship of our heavenly Father to his sleeping saints which brings them to life (which Bro. G. declares the *common* relationship does) must make them *immortal* and *incorruptible*," &c. No, brother, not *any* relation. The relation of *Lawgiver* and *Judge* does not accomplish this, but the peculiar relationship of REDEEMER. This glorious result is *not* "made certain by the '*common*'" relationship. You see therefore that "the *peculiar* relationship" is no "meaningless affair."

3. "If Bro. G. is correct in saying that, in case of the righteous, 'the *peculiar* relationship' is necessary to *perpetuate* the life which a '*common* relationship' secures, it follows inevitably that there must also be a 'peculiar relationship' to the wicked to accomplish the post-resurrection 'tribulation, anguish' and subsequent destruction Bro. G. believes awaits them.?' Indeed! What sort of logic is this, brother? Because the 'peculiar relationship' of *Redeemer* is necessary to perpetuate the conscious existence of the saints in glory, *ergo*, "a peculiar relationship to the wicked" is necessary to secure their temporary life for the purpose of actual suffering, according to the different degrees of their guilt, antecedent to their destruction! For the truth's sake, which I doubt not my brother is seeking, I ask him to inform us how he harmonizes such reasoning with our Lord's declaration of a "resurrection of condemnation."

In my view, it is of little importance to our controversy, whether the peculiar relationship *alone* is, or is not referred to in Luke 20 : 37, 38. It is undeniable that the subject of consideration in that passage is, not the *final judgment* of men, but the resurrection. It is to the passages which refer to the latter awful subject we must especially refer to ascertain the destinies of accountable men, although it is true that in John 5 : 28, 29 our Lord connects eternal life and condemnation with the revelation of the doctrine of the resurrection. So in Luke 20 : 36 he teaches the immortality of the resurrected righteous; but this is no proof of my brother's opinion in his paraphrase, that the wicked, who are to "come forth to the resurrection of —condemnation" will have no consciousness "before the judgment seat;" a supposition which with all due respect for my opponents, I must consider neither more or less than a ridiculous absurdity. Will our brethren inform us, for what purpose they are to be raised at all if they are to have no consciousness of the judgment.

I have only one more consideration at present to submit to the candid consideration of my esteemed brother. Suppose we should admit that our Lord in Luke 20th, considers the righteous dead as eternally living to God, and, (as the "antithesis" to this,) the wicked dead as *eternally* dead; how would this prove that the latter may not have a temporary life for the purpose of judgment, &c., any more than it proves that the righteous are not at present actually dead? If the righteous dead may now be considered as living to God on the ground of their resurrection to eternal life notwithstanding they are actually temporarily dead, the wicked may be considered as eternally dead on the ground of their condemnation to eternal death, notwithstanding they may be raised to a temporary life. Grace be with all who love our Lord Jesus in sincerity. O that we may "abide in him" in all holiness, "that we may not be ashamed before him at his coming."

HENRY GREW.

Response to H. Grew's Third Reply.

BY MACKNIGHT, JR.

The *first* of the "three assertions" quoted from my last response by Bro. Grew was not designed to convey the sense he seems to have given it.—My meaning was *not*—"must secure [to *all* the dead,] 'the resurrection of life' mentioned in John 5 : 29," but—"must secure [to the *righteous*] 'the resurrection,'" &c. With this explanation I pass to the *second* of the "three assertions" the "verity" of which my brother questions, and affirm (what I would also affirm of the *first*) that it is, every word of it, perfectly true. This statement shall be made good in few words, and that, I trust, to the satisfaction of even my respondent himself.—To begin, I observe that there is no future life except by means of a resurrection from the dead; (this Br. G. believes and teaches;) and it follows from this fact that "any relationship of our Heavenly Father to his sleeping saints which brings them to life," must bring them to life *by a resurrection*. Now as the word of God reveals *no resurrection* as awaiting "sleeping saints" except the one by which they are to "put on incorruption" and "immortality," (see 1 Cor. 15 : 52–54,) it follows that there can be *no* "*incorrectness*" in the *second* of the "three assertions" commented upon by Br. Grew. This I am confident the unprejudiced reader will see whether Br. G. does or not. "The ["common"] relation of *Lawgiver* and *Judge*," if *it* require the revival of "sleeping

saints" *at all*, demands that they shall come up either *mortal* or *immortal*. If it be the former, where have we a Scripture intimation of the fact? If the *latter*, what *more* could "the peculiar relationship of REDEEMER" do? And if it could *not* do more, would it not be a "meaningless affair?" I might dwell at some length on this point, but I trust it is not necessary.

A few words upon the *third* assertion cited.—What I meant by it was simply this: if the "*common* relationship" will bring a dead saint to *life* but cannot suitably *reward* him with *endless* life and happiness afterwards, so neither can *it*, having brought a dead *sinner* to life, *afterwards torment* and *destroy* HIM. "What" could be more conclusive than this "sort of logic," which by the way takes Br. G. upon his own *illogical* and indefensible ground? The simple fact is, "the '*peculiar* relationship' of *Redeemer* is" *just as* "necessary" to transform a dead saint to a "SPIRITUAL BODY," (which is the very thing he becomes when "made *alive*,") as it can be "to perpetuate the conscious existence of the saints in glory." Make a being *immortal* and the *perpetuity* of his "conscious existence" is put beyond all contingency. Remember, Br. G., our blessed Lord said, "neither CAN they die any more."

On Br. G.'s next paragraph I remark that it *cannot be* "of little importance to" *his side* of "our controversy, whether the peculiar relationship alone is, or is not referred to in Luke 20 : 37, 38;" for if he can find a *common* relationship in those passages, the "controversy" is settled in his favor. Can it be that Br. G. did not see this after all that had been said? The relationship our Lord referred to, if *common*, shows that by "the dead" (who "are [to be] raised," Luke 20 : 37) he intended "the dead *in general*."

The concluding "consideration" of the reply before us has received my most careful and "candid" attention. The reader will discover in it an effort to reconcile the theory of "a temporary life" for the deceased wicked with the supposition that *they*, as a class, are designated by "THE DEAD" in Luke 20 : 38. My respondent does not in so many words tell us that he indorses this supposition, but it is evident that he at least regards it with some favor. He seems to be cautiously *feeling* his way along, constantly receding from the view he gave of Luke 20 : 37, 38 in his first reply, but as constantly affirming that my "reasoning" on these passages is as nothing in his mind compared with "the plain and positive testimony" of such passages as John 5 : 29 and Acts 24 : 15, against the view he opposes. It is obvious enough that Br. G. has lost confidence in Luke 20 : 37, 38 as proving the re-living of the wicked dead—a circumstance which derives some *significance* from the fact that he omits to inform us, by any direct statement, that his views on these texts have changed or are changing. Whatever other brethren may think of it, I expect yet to see Br. Grew abandon the doctrine of the revival of the wicked dead, though I have no idea that my expectation of such a change of sentiment will hasten its consummation. My confidence is in the potency of truth and in Br. G.'s determination to act upon his honest convictions.

In his first reply to me he affirmed, without qualification, that by "THE DEAD" in Luke 20 : 37 was meant "the dead *in general*." Who that reads his second and third replies will suspect him of adhering to that opinion now? No one. In my last article I undertook to show that Br. G. had "virtually admitted that the '*peculiar* relationship' *alone* is referred to in Luke 20 : 37," and, by consequence, that by "THE DEAD" in that verse our Lord meant "*only* the deceased *righteous*." As he now makes no allusion to that section of my article, I conclude it was "a nail in a sure place." He would hardly fail to have charged me, in his present reply, with a misconstruction of his words, if I had made one.

But to the point. Br. Grew, in seeking to save his theory while supposing that the phrase "*the dead*" in Luke 20 : 38 applies to the deceased wicked as a class, is driven to a false interpretation of the phrase "*the living*" in the same verse. This latter phrase signifies, (as I will cheerfully undertake to prove if Br. G. denies it,) THE TEMPORARILY DEAD, and is hence applied to the *present* condition of deceased saints. Thus applied, it necessarily involves the idea of their revival into life—which was *the* thing, and the *only* thing, to be proved. The *perpetuity* of such life was *not* the point in dispute, nor the thing to be demonstrated by an appeal to "the book of Moses;" nor was *it* the ground of the declaration, "for all live unto him." The *deathlessness* of the resurrected saints had been *previously* affirmed in the blissful assurance of the Redeemer, "neither can THEY die any more." The declaration, "FOR all live unto him," [*i. e.*, they live in God's *purpose* and *covenant*,] was, I apprehend, designed by our Lord to *explain* why he employed the words "THE LIVING" to express the idea which we express by such phrases as, "the *temporarily* dead," or "those who shall live again."

Assuming, then, as an indisputable fact, that the words "*the living*," (Luke 20 : 38) mean "*the* TEMPORARILY *dead*, and that they therefore describe the condition of the righteous while "actually dead," I observe that the phrase "*the dead*" in the same verse—denoting (as the proper antithesis of "the *temporarily* dead") *the* ETERNALLY *dead*—must be understood to designate the *present* condition of the deceased wicked. *If it does* —"*they are* dead, they shall not LIVE." Isa. 26 : 14. The idea that our Saviour would base the revival into life of dead saints, whose God the Lord *is*, upon the fact that God is *not* a God of the wicked dead, *if* the latter class are also to be "made *alive*"—is, in my judgment, "neither more nor less than a ridiculous absurdity." But such an absurdity must Br. G. embrace if he admits that the wicked dead are referred to in Luke 20 : 38, and at the same time contends that "divine justice" requires that they shall have "a temporary life." One observation more, and I have done.—The supposition is not allowable that our Lord would, for the purpose of proving the resurrection of the righteous, have designated the wicked dead by words which *presuppose* their revival into life, while he left *their* revival unproved by himself and denied by his opponents. I trust Br. G. will see

the bearing of this remark upon the drift of his last paragraph.

If my beloved brother has no more to say on Luke 20 : 37, 38, I may wish to notice some of the passages he has so frequently referred to. If he replies to this, I do wish he would inform us what he believes to be the true import of the two verses we have been discussing ; I am anxious to know.

Respectfully submitted, with an unabated desire to know the truth.

MACKNIGHT, JR.

P. S.—Will Bro. Grew reply in the EXAMINER to the paragraph on 2 Tim. 1 : 10, from my pen, in No. 10, p. 151, of the current volume? With present light, I regard that text as irreconcilable with the theory of "a temporary life" for the wicked dead. If Br. G. can harmonize them I would be glad to see how he does it.

August 19, 1856.

CONCERNING EDITORS. — *The Evangelical Magazine* has an article suggesting the propriety of "Prayer on behalf of the Editors of Christian Journals." Mere human reason is an enemy of religion ; but true philanthropy goes hand in hand with the Christianity of the Bible. As philosophers, let us look at this subject with the seriousness which becomes it. If there is a single doctrine in the Bible reiterated in multifold forms, it is this, *That the blessings of the Almighty must be looked for authoritatively in the performance of duty ;* that is to say, in the rational employment of those means which are calculated to accomplish the end. We need not pray to be fed, unless we use means to procure food. The Church must first get a suitable man to be an editor ; to be such, he must be pious, educated, healthy ; neither of these three requisites has just precedence of the others. A man may be an educated infidel ; he may be a pious fool ; he may have piety and education, and yet dyspepsia may make him a ranting fanatic, a raving madman or a dogmatic driveller. Many an editor needs a pill more than a prayer. A worn out preacher is not fit for an editor ; no sick man is. There are editors of religious newspapers, whose piety we dare not question—on the contrary, we feel this moment, as if we would gladly exchange it for our own—and whose mental culture far exceeds ours, but whose intolerance of opinion, whose forwardness to publish the fallings and the failings of those of a different sect, whose impatient uncourteousness in editorial controversies, whose free dealings in ungentlemanly personalties, we would not possess for all creation. In fact, a most observable difference between the secular and the religious press, is this—that too many of the latter seem to riot in the freedom they feel, of security against being *called out*, to answer for the application of epithets, which men of the world would meet with a bullet.

It is a notorious fact, that the principal editor of one of the largest and most extensively circulated *religious* weeklies, is personally, in private life, one of the most amiable of men ; but as an editor, hurls against his antagonist, whether a public man or of private station, epithets so hard, so severe, so unfeeling, so unforbearing, so vindictive, that we all see he needs only the power, to make him an inquisitor. Taking this man's piety for granted, in connection with his known previous amiability of temper, the only solution of the incongruity is, that severe application has made him dyspeptic ; and this it is, that has vinegarized the whole man, which has made him a lost pleiad among the delightful characters of his time. Many men, who are so fortunate as to have no taste for liquor, have no difficulty in declaring, that any man who takes daily a glass of wine or brandy can have no religion ; and yet these same men will over-eat themselves three times a day, until the stomach, constitution, temper, health, all are ruined, and the remainder of their days are spent in scribbling sickly sentimentalities for other people. To make then, the religious press of this country what it ought to be—the handmaid of the Pastor and the Missionary—supply each paper with an editor who has the most vigorous health ; who has the learning of an Anthon, the piety of a Payson, and the bonhommie of a Sydney Smith—with a salary, prompt and unconditional, of five thousand a year. Such a man is well worth it, and one of the best economies of the Church would be, to supply such an one to every religious newspaper in the country. *Hall's N. Y. Journal of Health.*

"Rap Him again, Sharply.'

It was near sunset when I found myself at no great distance from a cottage, which had attached to it a piece of waste ground, partly surrounded with a fence of high boards. While looking up at the many colored clouds in the direction where the sun was declining in the sky, my attention was arrested by the sound of repeated blows, which appeared to be struck on a soft substance. Blow followed blow in such a regular manner, that they reminded me of men threshing in a barn with a couple of flails, only the sound was much duller than that made by threshers.

All at once the blows ceased, and then I heard a man cry out, "*Rap him again, sharply, for he has a deal of dust in him yet.*" The moment I came to the end of the high fence, I saw a large carpet, stretched on a rope, between two poles, and two men beating it with all their might. The mystery was now made plain, and I no longer wondered at the words, "Rap him again, sharply, for he has a deal of dust in him yet."

Now the thought may be considered a little fanciful, but it did occur to me that most of us have required, in our time, as hearty a drubbing as the carpet had received. "Yes," said I, "we all need to be tried, and chastised, and humbled, for we are proud, and selfish, and worldly-minded ; we think much of earth, and little of heaven ; much of ourselves, and little of our heavenly Father ; and beating is not more necessary to a dusty carpet, than trial is to those whose hearts are cleaving to the dust."

Now, considering the matter in this light, the wonder is not that we are beaten, but that we are

not always being beaten. Not that we should have affliction, but that we should ever be free from affliction, for we bring it upon ourselves by our transgressions.

"No earthly power can ward the coming blow,
Sorrow and sin through life together go."

Truly, we have all been dealt with very tenderly; what mercy is mingled with the seeming severity of the words of the Holy one, when speaking of his people: "If they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail."—Psa. lxxxix, 31–33.

As I returned from my pleasant walk, at the very moment that I repassed the cottage and the high fence, the same voice which I had heard before cried out, "*There, let us take him down now, for he looks all the better for his beating!*"

"Well," thought I, "the beaten carpet was not at all likely to be forgotten by me before, but now it is pretty sure to be retained in my memory.—That it looks the better for being beaten, I have no doubt at all. My evening walk has not been in vain, for I have at least obtained a subject for reflection."

If we all more steadily believed that the rod is meant to purify us, or, in other words, to get the dust out of us, we might then sit more quietly under the merciful corrections of our heavenly Father? How does this apply to you, my readers? Have you been beaten, and are you the better for it? Have any of you been visited with trouble, and can you say, "Before I was afflicted I went astray; but now have I kept thy word. . . . . It is good for me that I have been afflicted: that I might learn thy statutes?"—Psalm cxix, 67, 71.

"Look up! look up! when troubles frown,
That God may send a blessing down."

Hardly do I think that any of us reflect sufficiently on the value of our daily cares, which are, perhaps, after all, as necessary as our daily bread. When they draw us to our heavenly Father, we have indeed reason to be thankful for them. Sweet it is in the day of calamity and the hour of trial, to be able to cast all our cares on him who careth for us.

"Sweet in the confidence of faith,
To trust his firm decrees;
Sweet to lie passive in his hands,
And know no will but his."

O, the buffetings and beatings through which many of God's people have passed! Look over a small part of the "bill of fare," if I may so call it, of St. Paul's afflictions: "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." Yet all these were blessed to him!

You might think over this subject, and see if you cannot turn it to more advantage than I have done: The words of holy writ are very encouraging: "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him; for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."—Heb. xii, 5, 6. And again: "No chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby."

This little adventure of the beaten carpet often occurs to my remembrance, and especially so when my expected evil is overruled for good, or when my heart is humbled by any passing trouble. Again and again do the words appear to sound in my ears, at one time producing a smile, and at another an emotion of a much deeper kind: "*Rap him again, sharply, for he has a deal of dust in him yet;*" and "*There! let us take him down now, for he looks all the better for his beating.*"—*Ch. Ad. and Jour.*

TRUE PRAYER.—Would you see true prayer—would you know what prayer really is? Step into this Egyptian palace where Benjamin stands bound—his amazing and trembling brothers grouped around the lad. Judah advances. He bows himself before Joseph. His heart is full. His lip trembles. The tear glistens in his manly eye; and now, with tenderness thrilling in every tone, he pours forth his plea of surpassing pathos:—"Oh, my lord, let thy servant, I pray thee, speak a word in my lord's ears, and let not thine anger burn against thy servant: my lord asked his servants, saying, have ye a father or a brother? And we said unto my lord, We have a father, an old man, and a child of his old age, a little one; and his brother is dead; and he alone is left of his mother, and his father loveth him." Thus on he goes; and every sentence goes like a knife into Joseph's heart. And then he closes and crowns his appeal with this most brave and generous proposal: "Now therefore, I pray thee, let thy servant abide instead of the lad, as bondsman to my lord; for how shall I go to my father, and the lad not with me, lest I see the evil that shall come upon my father."—Joseph's heart, which has been swelling with emotion, is now ready to burst. He can stand it no longer; nor any wonder. This is prayer; and could we bring such earnestness to Jesus, oh, how would his tender, much more tender heart, melt like wax before it. Did we approach him with the fervor that glowed and burnt in Judah's speech: did we plead for our own souls or those of others, with such tears, in such tones, as Judah's when he plead for Benjamin, how would a divine brother discover himself to us? Now turn from that Egyptian to this Hebrew palace. There also is prayer. Two women stand before King Solomon. In the darkness of the night, one has crept with noiseless step to her neighbor's bed, and while the mother

slept, and the babe slept in her bosom, softly, cautiously, she steals the living child, and leaves her own cold, dead infant in its place. They carry the dispute to Solomon,—each claiming the living, and each repudiating the dead. With a skill that earned him his world-wide fame, the wise monarch summons nature as a witness. Horrible to hear, he orders the living child to be divided. The sword is raised,—another moment, and each mother gets a quivering half,—another moment, and interference comes too late. One stands calm, firm, collected, looking on with a cruel eye. With a bound that carries her to his feet, and a shriek that rings wild and high over all the palace, the other—the true mother—clasps her hands in agony, and cries, "Oh, my lord, give her the living child, in no wise slay it." That is prayer. That cry, that spring, that look of anguish,—all these proclaim the mother,—how different from the cold, callous, unimpassioned frame in which, alas, the best too often present themselves at the throne of grace, as if, when we are seeking pardon, it were a matter of supreme indifference, whether our prayers were or were not answered. Oh, how should we pray that God would help us to pray, and touch our icy lips with a live coal from off the altar.—*Dr. Guthrie.*

Trust for Daily Bread.

Half the world are in distress about their temporal support. Society is full of men who are disheartened by want of success, and fear of poverty. Their schemes have failed; disappointment makes them sad and dejected, and they think that they shall come to want. But a pious man must not yield to this despondency, nor cease from exertion. Let him still labor patiently, and hope for better days. Though he may not be able to see behind the setting sun, or know how he shall obtain bread on the morrow, still let him work on as long as he finds work to do, and God will provide. The promise is absolute: "Trust in the Lord, and do good, so shalt thou dwell in the land and verily thou shalt be fed."

Christians are guilty of criminal unbelief when they doubt the oversight and sympathy of God.—Poor, faint disciples! Have they not read that their "Heavenly Father knoweth that they have need of these things?" Let them yield up their hearts to a feeling of perfect trust, and they will find a happiness which no wealth can give. This sweet confidence in God takes away all the weakness into joy. Because of this child-like trust, many of the poor of this world, who were rich in faith—like the shepherd of Salisbury Plain—have been the happiest of men.

It is instructive to see how the poor saints are provided for. Yonder lives a widow who seems to have hardly the necessaries of life. Yet he who feeds the young ravens when they cry, feedeth her. He awakens sympathy; he creates a feeling of kindness in many hearts, so that her bread and water do not fail. One who had a long experience of life, declared, "I have been young and now am old, yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken nor his seed begging bread."—*Review and Her.*

The Last Will.—Said a Roman Catholic priest to a little boy whom he met by the way,—"What book is that under your arm?"

"It is a will, sir," said the boy.

"What will?" asked the priest.

"The last will and testament that Jesus Christ left to me, and to all who wish to claim a title to the property therein left," said the boy.

"What did Christ leave you in that will?"

"A kingdom, sir."

"Where does that kingdom lie?"

"It is the kingdom of heaven, sir."

"And do you expect to reign as a king there?"

"Yes, sir, as a joint heir with Christ."

"And will not every person get there as well as you?"

"No, sir: none can get there but those that claim their title to that kingdom upon the ground of the will."

THOUGHTS AND APOTHEGMS.

From Archbishop Whately.

Truth,—The Distinguishing Characteristic of Christianity.

The question, "What is true?" ought to stand on the threshold of every religious enquiry.

If the question, "What is true," be asked only in the second place, it is likely to receive a very different answer from what it would, if it had been asked in the first place.

That which is true and right loses, incalculably, its beneficial influence on the mind, when received on any ground than *because* it is true and right.

Truth is, in such an especial manner, the characteristic of the religion of Christ, that, in our Lord's reply to Pilate, He points it out as defining the very nature of His kingdom, of His objects, and His claims:—"For this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." And when, on other occasions, asserting His claims, He says, "If ye continue in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—"When the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all truth."—"Sanctify them through thy Truth; thy word is Truth." Thus, too, the Apostles repeatedly use the words "Truth" and "Faith" to designate the Christian religion. It is Truth resting on evidence, requiring Faith in it, on the ground of its truth.

The Christian religion made its appearance as the common disturber of the peace of the world, because it put an end to the tranquil influence of custom, authority, credulity, sentiment and imagination; forced men upon the disagreeable task of examining evidence, searching records, and proving all things; and arrayed in opposite opinions, children against their parents, subjects against their princes, and the people against the priest.

Christianity, contrasted with the Jewish system of emblems, is Truth in the sense of reality, as substance is opposed to shadows; and, contrasted with the Heathen Mythology, is Truth as opposed to falsehood. "The truth as it is in Jesus" was

to supersede the heathen idolatry, by destroying it; and "the Law and the Prophets," not by destroying indeed, but by fulfilling them.

The Heathen Mythology not only was not true, but was not even supported as true; it not only *deserved* no faith, but it *demanded* none. The very pretensions to truth—the very demand of faith—were characteristic distinctions of Christianity.

To believe in Christianity, without knowing why we believe it, is not Christian faith but blind credulity.

The word knowledge, strictly employed, implies three things; viz., Truth, Proof, and Conviction.

To say that there is the more virtue in Christian Faith, the less it is founded on evidence, is to forget that the Lord Jesus Himself—He who "taught as one having authority and not as the Scribes"—He who said not, as the Prophets of old, men *sent* from God, "Thus saith the Lord"—but, as Immanuel, God dwelling with his people, "*I* say unto you,"—appealed to his works as bearing witness of Him; and claimed the Divine "power to forgive sins," on the ground that He had the no less Divine power to bid the palsied cripple "take up his bed and walk."

The Apostles came forward rather in the character of witnesses, than as authoritative guides; and they work miracles and appeal to Scripture, not so much for the purpose of establishing their own right to deliver doctrines, as to *prove* the doctrines which they teach. And as with their first teaching, so also is it with the subsequent propagation of their religion. Though the Authors of the Gospels wrote, under the extraordinary superintendence of the Holy Spirit, those four distinct statements of evidence of matters of fact, yet it is not as the organs of inspiration they come forward, Their language is not, "Thus saith the Lord;" but, "He that *saw* it bare record." These things were "delivered unto us by those who, from the beginning, were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." They have so shaped their writings as to avoid what the method of authority would require, and force forward what the method of examination would demand; and have thus shown pretty clearly their intention, that the religion which they preached upon the ground of evidence, should be maintained and propagated also upon the same ground. "These things"—says the Evangelist John, speaking of Christ's miracles, wrought in the presence of his disciples—"were written that ye might believe . . . and . . . believing ye might have life through His name."

It has been said by a modern writer, that "the poor ignorant uninstructed peasant who says, 'I believe my religion because I have been told so by those who are wiser and better than myself; my parents told me so, and the clergyman of the parish told me so,' *comes nearest to the answer of the Gospel*,"—to that answer which the apostle Peter directs us to be ready to give "to every one that asketh a reason for the hope that is in us." And yet it is manifest this answer could have been given, when the Gospel was first preached, by no *Christian;* but might be, and *was*, given by every one of his Pagan neighbors.

This is to represent the Apostles of Christ as saying to those of whom they would make converts, "Let every succeeding generation receive quietly the religion handed down by its fathers, but let *this* generation act otherwise. Take up *novelty* for this once to oblige us, and ever after adhere to antiquity."

He who professes adherence to the national religion of England, on the ground that "it is the religion of his fathers," forgets, as do the hearers who applaud the sentiment, that, on this principle, the worship of Thor and Woden would claim precedence.

In these our days, there are an immense number of persons, who, professing faith in the Gospel, and zeal for its support, yet assure us that enquiries into its evidences, are likely to lead to infidelity. What would such a person say of some professed friend coming forward as his advocate, and saying, "My friend here, is a veracious and worthy man, and there is no foundation for any of the charges brought against him; and his integrity is fully believed in by persons who thoroughly trust him, and who have never thought of reasoning or enquiring about his character at all; but, of all things, *do not make any investigation*, for the more you enquire and examine, the less likely most people will be to believe in his integrity!" Surely a man so defended would exclaim, "Deliver me from my friends, and I fear not my enemies."

Those who boldly stand out and court enquiry, and bring forward cogent reasons for their conviction, are reproached, by a certain modern writer, with infirm faith and timidity. Timidity of all things! One is reminded of the story of some Indian savages serving as allies to the British in America, who, when the allied force was attacked by the enemy, ran and took shelter in the woods, while the British troops stood firm under a heavy fire, and repulsed the assailants. It was expected that their Indian friends would have been full of admiration at this display of superior valor; but, on the contrary, their interpretation of it was, that the British soldiers were such cowards that they were *too much frightened to run away*. Almost every chapter of the New Testament convicts the Lord Jesus and his followers of that "timidity," in appealing to the evidence of miracles and prophecies, which is censured and derided.

The danger of decrying all appeal to evidence is not confined to a mere want of adequate evidence for the truth of the Christian religion, but something distinct from, and beyond, this; the danger, namely, of a contrary presumption arising. It is not merely, that men, to whom sufficient evidence has not been furnished, will be likely, themselves, to reject what has not been proved to them; but that men of all clases—the learned as well as the unlearned—will be likely to regard it as a positive evidence against the religion, that it professes to be calculated for mankind in general, and designed to claim their rational belief,

while its defenders themselves confess that the object can not be accomplished.

To labor to prove a truth, is to imply the possibility of doubt, and to challenge inquiry; therefore an appeal to truth, as resting on evidence, is the characteristic of a true religion, which alone can satisfy doubts, or stand the test of enquiry.

The kingdom of truth the Lord came to establish, is a kingdom whose subjects should have been *admitted as such*, in consequence of their being "of the truth;" that is, not mere adherents of truth by accident, but *votaries* of truth. "Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice."

He only is "of the truth" who, with reverential love, is seeking, in candor and simplicity, to learn God's truth, and, in earnest self-devotion, to obey it at all seeming hazards; after the example of Him who "came into the world to bear witness unto the truth."

"I have Lived too Fast."

Such was the exclamation of the young man, Caldwell, who was convicted of embezzling money while acting as a Conductor on the Burlington Railroad, when he was arrested and told that he had been detected. There are volumes in that sentence, and it reveals the secret of his fall. He is a man of fine address, was one of the most popular of Conductors, had once a good character and good habits, was readily trusted, and had occupied positions of considerable responsibility. But he indulged his appetites and passions too freely; he was extravagant, associated with worthless and dissipated companions, and if he did not gamble, was compelled to exceed his income in his expenditure, to preserve appearances and defray his share of the expenses of the company he kept; and alas, in an evil hour, to meet these drafts upon his purse, he ventured upon the experiment of appropriating to himself a portion of the funds of the Company which were entrusted to him, and as the result, was discovered, arrested, tried, convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary. Disgrace and ruin followed hard upon his sin. His case is but another illustration of the text of Scripture, "The way of transgressors is hard."

Alluding to the phrase we have quoted, the eloquent counsel for the prosecution, in his concluding plea, said to the Jury:

"Ah, gentlemen, the pivot on which this sad drama turns is condensed into that single expression, "I have lived too fast!"—Pregnant words! they should fall from this Court Room like a tocsin, on the giddy whirl of young men below; the multitude that has watched, with varied emotions, but all with intense interest, the progress of this trial, should carry it forth and spread it in the saloons and in all the popular resorts of youth. 'I have lived too fast.' It is the most forcible, as it is the most graphic expression of the unhealthy life that characterizes—I shall be allowed to say—a multitude of young men in this beautiful city. In no town in the world do the centres of allurement and temptation bear such a proportion to the population. Extravagance in dress, extravagance in living, dangerous extravagance everywhere is apparent to the observer; nor need that observer wear Puritanical glasses to see what I allude to. Perhaps it is the inseparable incident to the marvelous growth of this great city, and that when things become more settled, and the more conservative institutions of society become established, then their superior moral force will cause all other elements and tendencies to revolve around the true central influences of society."

Will not young men take warning from this melancholy case and avoid the rock on which Caldwell made shipwreck? They should realize that pleasure purchased at the sacrifice of morals and honor, are bought too dear. Let those who would escape the danger of dishonesty avoid saloons and gambling houses, and the company of those whose ways take hold on hell. Let clerks and others who are entrusted with money, never yield for a moment to the temptation to fraud, for one dishonest act paves the way for another, and no one who takes the first step knows where his career will end, what disgrace and suffering he will bring on himself, what anguish he will cause to friends who are deeply interested in his welfare. "He," and he only, "that walketh uprightly, walketh surely." The dangers of a city life for young men are appalling; but he who acknowledges God in all his ways, will find the promise fulfilled, that HE will direct his paths.—*Congregational Herald, Chicago, Ill.*

"Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment." John 7: 24. Because a man seems to die without being punished for his sins, is he therefore to be made alive again *for punishment?* "The judgment of God" is, that he is "worthy of death." See Rom. 1: 32.

"Every eye shall see him," saith one. Yes: but, Whose eyes are intended? Not the eyes of "the world," for Jesus said, "The world seeth me no more," John 14: 19, 20.

NEXT EXAMINER.—Our next paper will be issued between the middle and last of October.—We ask the indulgence of our subscribers, this once, if it should not appear till late, as we expect to be absent from home for the next four weeks. After that the regular issue will be *twice* each month.

THE OFFICE OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER is at our *Residence,* 61 *Hicks street,* Brooklyn; a short distance from *Fulton Ferry:* but in all cases *address* us as follows:

GEO. STORRS,
Box 4658, *New York.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, OCTOBER, 1856. NO. 20.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

WANDERING THOUGHTS.

In the last EXAMINER this subject was presented to our readers, and to the observations then made we add a few more. In this article attention is called to the ASSOCIATING PRINCIPLE, in the mind itself, as a chief cause of "wandering thoughts."

By the principle or power of association, we mean that law whereby every idea suggests or awakens a successor, the result of which is, that an infinite series of thoughts pass through the mind during our waking hours. A word, an object, a movement, calls up a crowd of ideas, and these of the most heterogeneous kind. Let the reader, though he never attentively considered the subject before, pronounce, as an experiment, any word, for instance book, heaven, blood, and watch the diversified thoughts that will instantly, as if by magic, appear and vanish in his intellectual firmament. How many persons he beholds! What lands he visits; what strange acts he sees performed, deeds of mercy and deeds of crime! What serious and fantastic, secular and sacred thoughts rise into view; in fact, a very universe of ideas moves before his inward eye, apparently without rule and without order, yet each succeeding idea is linked to its predecessor by an influence, which acts with a beauty and regularity as invariable as the forces that keep systems revolving round their suns. A man may, as soon attempt to flee from himself, as to escape the law of association, to which his thoughts are subjected, Each new idea he forms or acquires is immediately brought under its control, as a drop of water falling into a river must yield to the influence of the advancing current.

To ignorance of this beautiful law, and the phenomena resulting from it, is chiefly to be traced the groundless sorrow of many, on account of their "wandering thoughts," and the only rational cure for this malady is to persuade them to stop and observe the unalterable functions appointed to their intellectual powers. In a pious man, thoughts flowing from this source are not, as has often been imagined, indications of depravity or of spiritual declension; they enter his mind, whatever be their character, by an unerring necessity.

That the principle we are illustrating may be still better understood, as well as the folly of repining at those thoughts, continually stirred up by its agency, even when we wish to indulge in the exclusive contemplation of one theme, let us glance over some of the leading advantages derived from this arrangement in the mental economy.

One obvious advantage is, that knowledge is thereby impressed and retained on the mind; it is kept in perpetual motion, and is neither allowed to stagnate nor sink into the depths of memory, whence perhaps it could never be recalled. With what velocity do all our ideas, at least, the more prominent among them, pass in review before us at our command, and often without any formal call! Now it is a well known fact, that we cannot give permanency to an idea more successfully than by making it frequently the subject of attention, and this is effected by the associating law.—It must at times ascend into the broad day light of the mind, however rapid its flight across the vision, and speedy its descent to the crowded shades.—The oftener it thus comes into view, the more confident we may feel that it has taken up with us a permanent abode. It has now become a link in the grand revolving chain of thought and imagery. If an idea entered and never appeared, but by a special exercise of authority over it, thousands of facts and conceptions would be lost for ever; having not been engraven on the memory, by frequent presentation to our consciousness, they would early pass into hopeless oblivion. We lose much of our knowledge even with our most admirable mental economy; but if we were otherwise constituted, it seems impossible to conceive how man could ever have become wise and intelligent,—his life must have been consumed in tantalizing efforts to reacquire what he had often learned, and as often lost.

It may be irksome, when occupied in serious meditation, to have extraneous thoughts pressed upon our notice, still it must be evident, that though they are useless at present, they probably have intrinsic value, and it may be very important that they should be often seen, and thereby indelibly impressed on the mind. The oftener they appear, the better they are known, and if not needed on all occasions, when they happen to be suggested, it would be a grievous misfortune were they to vanish from our store of information.

One benefit accruing from this law is, it gives us command of our knowledge, and enables us to make selections from it as occasion requires. During the day our ideas are in constant motion, myriads upon myriads pass through the mind, and were we to attempt to arrest their progress, we would only increase their number and accelerate

their speed. How useful this remarkable arrangement! Are we thinking on any particular subject, we can summon before us the facts and principles having any relation to it, with which we are acquainted; we have only to begin the work of reflection, and the associating principle, in a great measure, carries it on, and furnishes numerous cross-lights and illustrations from other departments of our knowledge. Each new idea is awakened by the one that preceded it; the will in this case, having set the train in motion. If ideas, when once imparted, returned not to consciousness, except as it were by accident, a fruitless task it would be to learn, or to attempt to propound wisdom. Every motive and encouragement, to store up information relating to the past, present, or future, would be enfeebled, if not annihilated, since no assurance could be rationally entertained, that it would ever be of any avail. Ideas, however laboriously got, or highly prized, might return to us, and they might not. Thus, after gathering knowledge, we would be obliged to rest satisfied with a vague impression, if happily, even that could be retained, that we were acquainted with certain subjects, if we only had power to bring forth our information, and in looking for its re-appearance, as for comets, we might need to spend months and years. In a mind thus organized, there could be no aberrations of thought, such as are usually complained of, but, assuredly at the expense of all continuous reflection, and all the advantages of knowledge. Again, suppose we had power over our ideas, with this proviso, that only one shall come and remain with us, during our pleasure, but that it shall introduce no companion and no successor. This appears to be a very simple and excellent arrangement; it would effectually exclude all "wandering thoughts," yet it would be miserably defective for the purposes of reflection and conduct. You observe, that in order to will the presence of an idea, there must be an impression that it is in the mind. In some cases we might be successful, but in how many, where no such impression existed, would our knowledge be irrevocably lost? Those who have been accustomed to much studious thought are well aware, that often, with no small astonishment, they have found themselves possessed of facts and arguments, of which they supposed they were entirely ignorant. These ideas, for time unknown, had lain dormant in their memory, and were unexpectedly quickened by the vivifying influence that streams from one idea to another. The utility of the associating law is strikingly manifested in those cases when we are wishing to recollect particular facts or sentiments, but find every effort directly to recall them utterly abortive. We are perfectly certain that they are in our possession, but they stand connected in the mind, with the particular circumstances in which they transpired, without a reminiscence of which they cannot be restored. Now experience teaches us, that if we can remember one of these events, the whole scene usually follows as a matter of course. We, therefore, endeavor to recollect the place, the time, the company, or the occasion when the facts occurred, or the observations were made, and having discovered one or more of these circumstances, the other events associated with it successively make their appearance. Our ideas, thus put under our control, become practically useful, and by the rapidity with which they advance, we are enabled to select what is found suitable for our purpose on any occasion.

By the associating principle, the sincere worshipper has the sublime doctrines that kindle and nourish his religious feelings, hopes, and joys, continually and collectively brought to remembrance; the name of Jesus, for example, suggests his whole life, sufferings, and death. The believer sees him in the past, the present, and the future, and he is indebted to that law, which intersperses his meditations with foreign, and in the mean time, useless ideas for the boundless exhibition of sacred truth. Conducted, with immeasurable speed, over the vast field of religion, he can select the topic best fitted for his meditation, the promise best suited to his case, and the counsel best adapted to his peculiar situation.

From the preceding observations it will be evident, that the law we are considering may be successfully employed to furnish subjects of religious thought, of pure and tranquil joy to the genuine believer, whether he be at home or abroad. He has only to conjoin particular statements of revelation with surrounding natural objects and appearances. This, from the style of scripture, is easily accomplished. Figurative language is so abundant in the sacred volume, and generally drawn from objects and scenes as familiar to us as to the eastern nations, that these objects and scenes when beheld may, with a little care and exertion, be compelled invariably to suggest those passages of scripture where they occur either metaphorically or by way of illustration. For instance, with the mountains may be associated that sublime statement, "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God."—With the rivers, the conforting assurance, "There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God." With the green fields, the solemn momento, "All flesh is grass, and the glory of man is as the flower of the grass." And with the stars, the glorious reward, "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmanent, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." Thus universal nature is clothed with inspiration. A voice is heard from every rock and glen, every mountain and forest, from the earth below and the sky above, discoursing to the christian, of sin and salvation, death and eternity, hell and heaven.

Before leaving this branch of the discussion, it is proper to give a word of caution and advice to the faithful, relating to the expulsion of these foreign and unfriendly ideas, that are suggested during serious meditation and sacred exercise; the advice is briefly, *when they come, let them go.* The horror and even disgust which they often create, tends to produce reflections about them, which only give the ideas a present and more permanent hold. To look at them is to retain them. In the majority of instances they would instantly pass on with the crowd, but the act of turning the eye toward them is an unconscious signal inviting them to remain.

The only resource is to compel the mind to return to the original train of reflection, and though it may struggle to be free, the effort must be continued till a triumph is accomplished.

Never let it be forgotten, also, that the voluntary retention of such ideas, impart to them the quality of crime, arising from the nature of the conceptions themselves, or the circumstances in which a disciple may be placed. The mere fact of their presence does not constitute guilt, for we cannot hinder them from entering our mind; but they may be of a character, that it is impossible to cherish them in any situation, without committing inward sin, or they may be lawful at other times, though most improper when their author is engaged in the solemnities of religion. We can never, without becoming criminal, voluntarily entertain malicious, covetous, invidious, or impure desires, which may be awakened by their relative ideas being suggested and dwelt on by the mind; and it would be no less profane to indulge in thoughts concerning worldly possessions and business, even when they are suggested during the worship of God. Here is danger which must be carefully avoided, and to be avoided successfully, we need to exercise unremitting viligance and prayer, "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." G-

NEANDER'S HYPOTHESIS OF THE PAULINE DOCTRINE OF THE FUTURE LIFE.

BY J. PANTON HAM, ENGLAND.

The eminent German theologian, Dr. Augustus Neander, through the enterprising labors of the popular publishers, Messrs. Clark and Bohn, has taken a distinguished place among our English theological literati, and no doubt is exercising some considerable influence on the religious sentiments of English society. Besides the scholastic repute of Neander, there is an air of ingenuousness, and the absence of polemical acerbity in his writings, which cannot fail to recommend them to that happily increasing class of readers, who refuse to hold parley with any author in whom candor and courtesy are not conspicuous qualities. Dr. Neander has, in addition to other important works, written a "History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles," a book which, as it is now within the reach of all English readers, may be profitably read by all. In this work the author discusses Christian doctrine in all its details, and as it is presented through the differing mental media of the first Apostles of Christianity. From many of the learned doctor's views, we are conscientiously obliged to dissent. Catholic as his mind was, and well furnished with all the apparatus of a thoroughly Biblical student, he does not appear to us to have escaped, any more than other men, those warping theological predilections, which give the aspect and coloring to our several views of Scripture teaching, and identify us with separate theological parties. We do not hesitate, therefore, to canvass the opinions of even such a man as Neander, whose piety and learning, while they claim our reverence and modesty, cannot forbid the dissentient expression of our conscientious judgment.

Writing of the peculiarities of the Pauline doctrine, our author remarks, that Paul

"usually connects the doctrine of the eternal life of the individual with the doctrine of the resurrection, and says nothing of the life of the soul in an intermediate state after death, till the end of all things. The designation of death as a sleep in relation to the resurrection that is to follow, may favor the opinion that he considered the state after death to be one of suppressed consciousness like sleep, and admitted that the soul would first be awakened at the resurrection of the body, though in every other reference to death, he could describe it under the image of sleep as a transition to a higher existence. When in the Church at Thessalonica, the anxieties of many were excited respecting the fate of the believers who had already died, he only intimates to them that at the time of Christ's second coming, the believers then alive would not anticipate those who were already dead. But it might be supposed that had he admitted a continuance of consciousness in a more exalted and intimate communion with the Lord as taking place immediately after death, he would have reminded the persons whose minds were disturbed on the subject, that those for whom they mourned had already been admitted to a higher and blessed communion with their Lord, as the later Fathers of the Church would not have failed to have done."—*History of the Planting, etc., page* 524.

The above is a very candid statement of the objection, on Scriptural grounds, to a condition of *disembodied life in death* for the human being.—But, strange as it may appear to some of our readers, Neander does not feel its force. He thinks he can furnish a satisfactory solution of the difficulties of this objection, by asserting that "in every other reference to death he (Paul) could describe it under the image of sleep as a transition to a higher existence." But it remains to be proved that Paul *so* described death, and until such proof is supplied, the assertion is merely gratuitous.

The chief stress of Neander's argument in support of a state of uninterrupted life even by death, is laid on what he calls "a progressive development of the divine life in communion with the Redeemer," by which we presume he means, that connection with Christ is the bond on which immortality or deathlessness depends, a doctrine which we cordially subscribe as, in our judgment, a clearly established Scripture doctrine; but, if in addition to this, we are to understand that the principle of immortal life is in some mysterious manner imparted to the believer at the time of his first spiritual union with Christ, which gradually develops the strength and perfection of its vitality, and which progressive development is not interrupted, but rather advanced by the dissolution of death, then our simple reply is, that we cannot find any scripture authority for such doctrine. To our apprehension there is nothing very intelligible in the phrase, "a progressive development of the divine life." Does our author use this term "life," in a literal or figurative sense? If the latter,

then it expresses a sense wholly apart from the subject under discussion, which is the alleged continuance, not of a figurative, but a *literal* life, during the season of death. To be pertinent to the matter in hand, we must understand the word "life" literally, and we repeat that we cannot understand what the learned author means when he talks about believers receiving "a progressive development of the divine life (existence) in communion with the Redeemer." This is a doctrine of regeneration which, however it may accord with German modes of thought, is to us neither intelligible nor Scriptural.

But of what avail is this theory of Neander's to the general doctrine of human immortality? Evidently none. The argument by which he would vindicate the doctrine of a continued life for the believer in Christ, during death, even were it a sound argument, involves the denial of a continued life, or essential immortality of men constitutionally considered. This "progressive development of the divine life," let it be observed, is only "in communion with the Redeemer." If therefore, it is begotten and perfected by the Christian doctrine and spirit it demonstrates, not the natural immortality of the soul, but a *communicated immortality through Christ.* This "progressive development" is described, by our author, *not* as a *natural*, but a *Gospel* or *Christian* development, and compels the inference, that, if there is a condition of disembodied existence and life in death, it is exclusively for believers in Christ, all others have no "progressive," and therefore no intermediate life, but cease to have any conscious existence in death. It is obvious that this theory is not broad enough to furnish a platform for the popular doctrine.

Neander has a plausible but a very unsatisfactory mode of accounting for the acknowledged fact that the Apostle Paul never makes any mention of the disembodied soul, and a state of existence between death and resurrection.

"The thought of the resurrection and everlasting life were in his mind so closely connected, that he would be induced to leave the interval between the death of believers and their resurrection as an empty space."—p. 526.

How they came to be "so closely connected" he explains thus:

"As long as he expected the Second Coming of Christ, and the final resurrection as near at hand, he had little occasion to separate from one another the ideas of an eternal life after death and of a resurrection; and in accordance with the Jewish habits of thinking, he blended them together in a manner that led to the idea of a certain sleep of the soul after death."—p. 527.

This explanation appears to us neither natural nor scriptural. It certainly is not natural to our life-loving race to take no account of so solemnly affecting an interval, however short it may be, as that between death and resurrection, and leave it as "an empty space," deserving neither our personal regard, nor even a mention. Nature, our nature, undoubtedly abhors such a vacuum as this. Our instincts will not suffer us to treat with indifference this mortal interval. If revelation makes no authoritative deliverance on the subject, conjecture will labor to supply its place. The Platonic notion of the soul and its inherent immortality originated in the natural anxiety to fill up this unknown void in the best way possible. But it is conclusive against the hypothesis of Neander, that we have Paul's own declaration of the importance of being informed of this "interval." In his epistle to the Thessalonian believers, (who, it should be borne in mind, were so anticipating the *immediate* coming of Christ as to need a second epistle, to assure them that "the day of Christ" was not so nigh "at hand" as they expected,) the Apostle expressly says, "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep," etc. So far from describing the "sleep" of these believers "as a transition to a higher existence," as Neander asserts, the Apostle speaks of them as "the *dead* in Christ," who in order to a future life need to "rise" from the dead. Their state is contrasted with that of himself and those to whom he was writing, whom he describes as "we which are *alive* and remain." Now had these deceased believers been known to be then alive enjoying a higher "progressive development of the divine life," their surviving relatives would not have expressed such affectionate anxiety about their participation in the blessings of Christ's second coming; and supposing they were ignorant of this condition of progressive life, the Apostle would have comforted them by revealing it "as the later Fathers of the Church would not have failed to have done," and not by assuring them, as he does, their deceased friends would "rise first" from their graves, and be brought along with Christ to welcome and be united for ever with them who should be "alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord." But our author is not baffled even by this apparent insurmountable difficulty. He surmises, not indeed without some misgivings, that when Paul wrote his first epistles to the Corinthians and Thessalonians, he was not sufficiently enlightened on the state of believers after death:—

"It might happen that he was led to a more perfect understanding of the truth exactly at that point of time when it was required for his own religious necessities, and those of future generations."—p. 527.

To say nothing of what this mode of evading the difficulty implies in respect of the absolute value of the earlier Pauline writings, which are obviously reduced to a chronological and relative worth, it is quite sufficient to reply that the illumination of Paul's mind, as the apostle to the Gentiles, was not, we should think, mainly in the view of "*his own* religious necessities and those of *future* generations," without any regard for the *existing* generation, whom he was especially sent to serve. There is something very selfish in the view that Paul's illumination was specially "required for his own religious necessities," and moreover something singularly strange in the notion that such personal illumination should be needed for "*future* generations," to the entire disregard of the religious necessities of the apostle's own generation. The Thessalonian and Corinthian be-

lievers of Paul's own times needed as much apostolic light as their successors, and we should think would not fail to have all the light which their "religious necessities" required, especially as Paul had been officially set apart by the Head of the Church for their special service.

But Neander himself thinks, although he has ventured on this supposition, that it is weakened by the fact, that Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians about five years after that to the Thessalonians, in which he gives even greater prominence to the doctrine of resurrection, and the future life apparently dependent on that event. Only a few months elapsed between writing the first and second epistles to the Corinthians, and he thinks it unreasonable to suppose that Paul should have remained in ignorance of the doctrine of a continued and conscious life between death and resurrection during so long and important a period of his apostolical career.

"It is not probable," he writes, "that in the few months between the time of his writing the first and second epistle to the Corinthians, such a revolution had taken place in his mode of thinking on this subject."—p. 528.

Surely "it is not probable," nor is it probable that in his second epistle to the Corinthians the apostle should flatly contradict what he had written in his first epistle only a few months previously, and without explaining that his own mind had passed through a considerable change since he last wrote. We say "flatly contradict," because, if the 5th chap. of the second epistle is understood to teach a condition of conscious life during death, then it appears to us to be absolutely irreconcilable with the very emphatic teaching of the 15th chap. of the first epistle. It will at least be conceded that Paul *seems* to teach the state of unconsciousness during death in his first epistle; indeed our author, as we have seen, candidly admits this, as it is also admitted in the very effort he makes to reconcile the doctrine of the two epistles. If then Paul *only seemed* to teach such a doctrine in his first epistle, and made use of language, "that lead to the idea of a certain sleep of the soul after death," as Neander affirms, it was surely important for him to guard his Corinthian converts against such a misapprehension in his second epistle, especially as it is maintained that he there teaches in a very detailed and particular manner the opposite doctrine. But no cautionary or explanatory remark is made, and therefore, in our judgment, it is far more reasonable to conclude that the second epistle, instead of being supposed to contradict or even to qualify the contents of the first on this important doctrine, ought to be read and interpreted in the clearer and more positive light of the first. We cannot, therefore, accept the following conclusion of our learned and excellent author, which we are constrained to regard as both unscriptural and mischievous.

"From a comparison of the first and second epistle to the Corinthians, we may therefore conclude that Paul, even when in his earlier statements respecting the resurrection, he said nothing of the state of the souls of individual believers in the interval between death and the resurrection, still admitted the uninterrupted development of a higher life after death, though he did not particularly bring it forward, as he was accustomed to found all the hopes of believers on the resurrection of Christ, and to connect them with the doctrine of the resurrection; perhaps, also, he thought that last great event so nigh, and was so constantly turning his attention to it, that his mind was not directed towards the other fact. But as he became aware that the period of the consummation of the kingdom of God was not so nigh as he had formerly anticipated, he was induced to bring forward more distinctly a subject which had hitherto been kept in the background."—p. 529.

The reader cannot fail to be struck with the obvious *indecision* of the above language. We are told in the very same paragraph that Paul "admitted the uninterrupted development of a higher life after death," and yet he was probably so occupied with some other aspect of doctrine "that his mind was not directed towards" this "fact!" This "fact" was "kept," we are told, "in the background," not designedly, but because the apostle had made a mistake, during a large portion of the time of his apostolic ministry, in reference to the time of Christ's second advent!! When he was better informed on the subject of the second advent, "he was induced to bring forward more distinctly" this doctrine of conscious life in death, "which had hitherto been kept in the background!!" Such is our author's conclusion: whether the reader is content to receive it, must be left to himself to decide; for our own part, we unhesitatingly reject it, as we do the premises from which it is deduced.

It is somewhat remarkable that so enlightened and independent a writer as Neander should think it necessary to accept the popular construction of two or three disputed passages of Paul's epistles, and for the sake of that construction remain content with an hypothesis at once so questionable and unsettled as that which he consents to adopt. We cannot withhold the expression of our belief that the author's confidence in his own psychological system, has been even greater than his confidence in the authority of the apostle. Neander seems to assume that, on the doctrine of the soul, Platonism and Christianity are at one, and hence he approaches the New Testament as some of the earlier Christian Fathers did, many of whom were Platonic philosophers, and who received Christianity not so much as a religious revelation, as a system of the most perfect philosophy, and who "retained with their philosophical mantle, their philosophical turn of mind also."* We would not be disrespectful to our German brethren, to whom we feel ourselves under great obligation in most departments of literature, and especially in the department of Biblical literature; but in our judgment, their excessively speculative tendency, their apparent fondness of the vague and obscure, and their somewhat licentious phraseology, are against any distinguished success in the department of Scripture exegesis. The very simplicity

* Gieseler's Compend. of Eccles. Hist.

of the Bible is likely to prove the greatest stumbling-block to German expositors. The sacred writers were simpler men than modern scholastics commonly allow them to be. We question much whether they themselves were conscious of so many subtle sublimities as have been imputed to their writings. Their mission was to set the world right in matters of religious faith and practice, and it is no compliment to them when they are hailed as co-partners in the world's philosophies, and treated as co-equals with modern doctors of divinity. This kind of treatment the sacred writers have too commonly received. Neander himself has recorded this fact in the first ages of Christianity, and we believe that it has always been more or less true in the historic progress of Christian doctrine, down to our own time. "The new Platonism," he writes, "could not bring itself to acquiesce, particularly in that *humility of knowledge*, and that *renunciation of self* which Christianity required. . . . . The religious eclecticism of this direction of the spirit could do no otherwise than *resist the exclusive and sole supremacy* of the religion that suffered no other at its side, but would subject all to itself."* This intolerance of an unqualified submission to the authority of Scriptural Christianity has so successfully prevailed in the earlier periods of the Church's history, that purely human and speculative notions have become as thoroughly established Christian doctrines, as the traditions of the Jewish elders became incorporated with Scriptural Judaism.—Men hold these doctrinal innovations now, not because they are proudly intolerant of Scripture authority, but because a pious submission to that authority seems to them to require it. A knowledge of Church and Doctrine history would open the eyes of many of our Christian brethren to the unsoundness of their so-called orthodoxy, by revealing to them the circumstances and influences which have contributed to the rise and modification of religious doctrines. And a more thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures, and exclusive deference to their authority, would bring about a Reformation even more extensive and important than that in the 16th century, in which so much confidence unfortunately reposes, as though that were *par excellence* "*the* Reformation," and its conclusions ultimate and complete.

* "General History of the Christian Religion and Church." Vol. 1. p. 46.

STRICTURES ON BISHOP BULL.

Br. Storrs: *Dear Sir*—In the last number of March, page 95, a piece appears, headed, "On the Final Regeneration," in which we think the writer, (Bishop Bull) has quite mistaken the subject he treats on, and greatly mangled and misinterpreted the scriptures. This we say, with all deference for the writer of the piece, towards you, and towards the readers of the Bible Examiner.

Indeed, the writer of the following annotations, may be mistaken on his part; we claim no infallibility, or exegesis, beyond that which is common to all men, viz., to determine the sense of all written language by a strict adherence to common sense, the propriety of things, the context in which the matter is involved, the sense of the writer, and the concurring sense, and ideas, expressed by writers of the same age.

Should you consider the following remarks of sufficient value to entitle them to a place in your paper, you will confer a favor on the writer, and possibly also, on your general readers.

1. The writer of the piece "On Final Regeneration," first finds fault with the 'pointing' of the present translation in Mat. 19, in which the subject occurs; and in the second place to affect and to seek to make the Evangelist, or rather Jesus, (who is the speaker) to teach that the word, 'Regeneration,' refers not to this life, but to the future—not to time, but to eternity; and in truth to merge the word itself into the resurrection, and as if the word, regeneration, was only consummated at, and in, the resurrection.

This is the representation of the matter wherein Bishop Bull, and the writer, stands at direct issue.

This discussion has its source, from Peter saying to his Master, "Behold we have forsaken all and followed thee,"—to which comes the reply, "Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." So I read the text.

Now how any one can seek a different 'pointing' and rendering of the text we are at a loss to understand. Our friend, and opponent, renders the passage thus: "Ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory," &c., by which 'mis-pointing,' as we call it, the speaker, (Jesus) is said, or caused to say, that the Regeneration refers not to a *state of being*, *here*, and *now* present, but prospective, and consequent on the resurrection from the dead! That such an idea should enter into the head of any one, is to us, totally unimaginable.

Most true it is that the apostles cannot be said to sit upon the twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, until the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory; by which we understand his coming with the trumpet of God to raise the dead. Now, allowing this to be true, we ask is there no intermediate state consequent on believing Jesus to be the Messiah and the resurrection? We say there is, and called by the Lord Jesus, a state of Regeneration. This glorious state of being, this heaven-born state of bliss, our friend and opponent seems to be a stranger to, or at least virtually fritters it away by merging it in the resurrection, or making it consequent only in the resurrection. How unwise, how irreverent, how defective of the Holy Spirit to ask with a flourish, "What is regeneration?" thus, "In the Regeneration—what is that?" then instantly comes a disjointed, though self-applauding, reply, "Not in baptism, nor in the regeneration or renewing of the Spirit, as some have fancied, for neither of these significations will make good sense in this place; but in the Resurrection, which will be indeed a regeneration, or

second generation of men to life, after that life which they had in their first generation was extinguished, &c., &c.

This unsightly and unmeaning quotation is both irrelevant to the point and unscriptural in itself, and is more fitted to create the blush, with sorrow and shame, in its bare recital, than any other feeling.

In treating of the doctrine of regeneration, there is nothing inapposite or wrong in asking what it is, or what the term signifies; but we cannot help thinking that there is something, most wofully uncouth, not to say, indicating unbelief, and disrespect to the subject.

We next object to its caption, title, or style of introduction, viz. "Final Rege eration."

The word, final, to our conception, indicates a multiple, or something that stands in numerical order, or, as one of many. The regeneration spoken of in the New Testament, has no such designation, or signification; but is a *unit*, or a state of *one*, and not of many.

The term, "Regeneration," though always of one meaning and signification, is expressed in the N. T. under different words and phraseology. Thus "to be born again;" to be "created of God in Christ Jesus unto good works"; to be "a new creature," now "ye are clean through the word I have spoken unto you," &c., all of which teach and signify *Regeneration*, or that alteration, or changed life, in thought, spirit and action, inseparable from believing Jesus to be the Messiah of God. The opposite of which alteration, or change, or regeneration, being a state of unbelief. That the newness of life, here described, is immediate, present, and consequent of believing, is as certain as the shadow is the reflection of the rays of the sun on an intervening substance; or as the reverberation or echo of a stroke, on a piece of wood or metal. And, as it is said of one of the early churches, "as soon as ye heard of the gospel of your salvation, *ye became followers of the churches of God*; which in Judea, are in Christ Jesus." And as said on another occasion, "If ye keep in memory that which I preached unto you," &c.

That the whole drift and concurrent testimony of the N. T., or new Covenant, is all in the present, and active tense, thus: "*ye who have followed me*, in the regeneration;" or, as it may be expressed, "followed me, in my reign, kingdom or Messiahship,"—for to enter *this reign*, or kingdom, a man must "be born again." And this of course is immediate and cannot be a matter at, in, or after, the resurrection.

Here we can well afford to bid a final adieu to this controversy; but will simply ask a little farther indulgence, to show in scripture language, how this *change is effected*; its hope, aim, object or determination. Thus the Apostle Peter,—"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his great mercy has regenerated us to a lively hope, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and unfading, preserved in the heavens for us, who, by the power of God, are guarded through faith to the salvation prepared to be revealed in the last time," &c. Thus we see 'Regeneration' to be something, '*according to the great mercy of God.* (1) That it has for its object, '*a lively hope.*' (2.) And that this *hope* originates, or is based upon the *resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.*" (3.) That it has for its ultimatum or consummation, "an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and unfading, preserved in the heavens," &c. (4.) That this inheritance is attainable, at the '*revelation*' of Jesus Christ, i. e., when he comes to raise the dead. (5.) . . . &c., &c. "Wherefore," continues the apostle, "having the loins of your minds girded, being vigilant, *constantly hope for the gift to be brought to you, at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" Now, my kind reader, attentively consider how apt, how consonant, how admissible, how ready to conceive, of such a 'Regeneration,' of such a renovation, of such a new state of living, and acting under; arising from so strong an evidence, viz., the great mercy of God—and the resurrection of his well beloved Son—and of the inheritance, and gift, to be brought to believers, at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Also, to the same effect, see Paul to Titus:—saying, "For the favor of God, which brings salvation, has appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world—expecting the blessed hope; namely, the appearing of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

Also, "For even we ourselves were formerly foolish, disobedient, erring, slavishly serving divers inordinate desires and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But when the goodness and philanthropy of God our Saviour shone forth, he saved us—not on account of works of righteousness which we had done—but according to his own mercy, through the bath of regeneration, and renewing of the holy Spirit which he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his favor, we might be made heirs, according to the hope of eternal life." Thus, then, we learn what it is to be under the influence of regeneration, its mode and manner of action.

But then, mark, the incident is one thing, and the occasion of it, is another.

For the present, I must forbear. Entertaining the best hopes, and kindest wishes, I remain, my dear Sir, yours, in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ.

JOSEPH ARMORER.

TRIUMPH OF FAITH.—During an earthquake that occurred a few years since, the inhabitants of a small village were generally very much alarmed, and at the same time surprised at the calmness and apparent joy of an old lady whom they all knew. At length one of them, addressing the old lady, said: "Mother——, are you not afraid?" "No," said the mother in Israel; "I rejoice to know that *I have a God that can shake the world.*"

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, October, 1856.

AT HOME AGAIN.—Since our last issue we have travelled sixteen hundred miles, and made the acquaintance of several excellent families, which has well paid us for our labor. Those families will ever be remembered with lively interest. Our stay among them was short, but most agreeable ; and we trust profitable to them and to us. Our principal labor was at *Reading*, Mich., some ten miles southward from *Hillsdale*. Br. A. N. SEYMOUR, resides there. He and his beloved wife have labored much in Michigan for several years. We trust they have not done so in vain. The Lord has greatly blessed their labors in the vicinity where they now reside. May those beloved families be abundantly blessed of the Lord. We parted with them all with mutual regrets at the necessity; but hope to meet again when our Lord shall return from heaven.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER may hereafter be looked for about the first and fifteenth of each month, as we intend the *semi*-monthly issue shall be regular. The EXAMINER for June 1st was by mistake numbered 10 : it should be 11. This will explain to a *new* subscriber why he has "*two* of No. 10."—Our *Office* is at our residence, 62 *Hicks Street*, Brooklyn, a short distance from *Fulton Ferry:* but in all cases *address* us as follows :

Geo. Storrs, Box 4658, New York.

To new subscribers, who send us $2 for the EXAMINER for 1857, we will send *gratis* the last *eight* numbers of the present year. Will our friends see what they can do to increase our list of subscribers immediately? We should like to know as early as possible how many we are likely to have for the next volume. Some, we expect, will leave supporting the EXAMINER on account of the "*Life from the Dead*" question. We are sorry, of course, to lose them ; but we had rather part with them all than part with our liberty of thought and expression, which we have purchased with the loss of all earthly possessions and prospects.

"LIFE FROM THE DEAD : OR, THE RIGHTEOUS ONLY WILL LIVE AGAIN."—This work, of which we spoke in our last issue, is now ready to be published. Shall the issue take place? If so, funds must be had from some quarter, and *we* have none. Will all who feel an interest on the subject let us know what they will do in the matter immediately? If they cannot advance money now, how much will you do when the work is out? Some have spoken already : shall we hear from others soon? About $150 will be needed to issue the first thousand copies ; and those who advance funds immediately shall have the amount returned in the work at the first cost, or the money refunded when the edition is sold, if they prefer it.

P. S.—Since the foregoing was in type we have received a note from "MACKNIGHT JR," saying, "I have perused your MSS with much interest, and am anxious to have it published. I will take at least ten dollars worth of the work at first cost (or at the wholesale price) immediately on its publication."

If all our friends, who wish the work issued, and who are more able than Macknight Jr., to help, will be as prompt as he, the work would be out within a month.

"MAN'S DESTINY.—*Immortality :* Arguments from Nature and Scripture, by Rev. T. M. POST, D. D., St. Louis, Mo. ; *Reviewed by* GEO. STORRS, Editor of *Bible Examiner*."

To encourage the friends of the cause we advocate to circulate this work, we will put it, *for cash* with the order, at $15 per hundred. This is less than the first cost ; but we hope that several thousands may be called for and then we shall be made whole, otherwise we suffer loss in issuing the work. By the dozen copies $2. 40. Bound copies 50 cts. each, or $3.60 per dozen.

THE TEXT BOOK.—We have learned from several quarters, that there are Methodist Preachers, out of the city, who use Prof. Mattison's arguments, in their discourses against our views, taken from his discussion with us, in some cases *verbatim*, actually writing them out and preaching them as their own. In all such cases our friends should be zealous enough to supply their congregations with copies of the "DISCUSSION" itself. Let their hearers see that their ministers have worked with borrowed tools without giving the Prof. credit ; and let them know that the originator—the notable Prof.—— left the field of controversy in no honorable manner.

Now to help those disposed to work in this matter, we will put the Discussion, a pamphlet of 168 pages with covers, at *twelve* dollars per hundred copies for cash ; or by the dozen, $1 75. The retail price is 25 cents. Cannot some thousands be

scattered the coming winter in various parts of the country? Let all Methodist Preachers have this "text book" and their congregations be fully supplied with the same. Our friends all know how we were treated, at the close of that discussion, by the Prof., through the *Christian Advocate* of this city. The "*Discussion*" will tell the whole truth in that matter, only let it be scattered.

"SHALL WE VOTE?"—We answer—*Yes*, if you have common sense and common honesty. If you have neither take care not to. If you are determined to vote simply to sustain "*our party*," you may know yourself to be deficient in sense and honesty. Can you pray "for all in authority," that they "may rule in the *fear* of God," and "be *just* men," and at the same time refuse to exercise a right which God has given you to *vote* for such men? But "Christ and his apostles did not vote." Very true: but they lived under a despotism where no one could vote. Every man having such right, is, in our judgment, just as much bound to use that right in the selection of rulers as he is to pray for them when they are elected. But with *party* quarrels and strife a Christian man has nothing to do; yet peaceably to deposit his vote, under the influence of *principle*, according to his honest judgment of the rights of freemen, is by no means making him a "*meddler* in politics," but is the discharge of a duty towards God and men, without which he mocks God in praying for those "in authority;" because he has *not done* what he could to have "just men" for rulers. "But, Christ is coming to reign soon." Blessed news. *We* have deposited our *vote* for him and wish not to change it; but till his *inauguration* we have to be ruled by imperfect men. Let not our vote be wanting to elevate those who, in our judgment, will rule most in the fear of God. "But, I may mistake in a selection of rulers." Yes, and you may mistake in your prayers, or in searching the scriptures, as all have done at times; but that is no reason why we should not try to do better and do all we can.

We shall vote, if the Lord will. If Jesus comes while we are depositing our vote, we shall rejoice because he is our *first* and *only* choice for a *permanent* Ruler and King. But till he does come, having the right to vote for human rulers we shall do so with the same heavenly mind that we can pray for such rulers.

Yet, to all, we say, *Beware* that you do not become drunk with the political excitement of a mere partizan politician. Such a course becometh not a follower of Christ.

THE TRUE CHRISTIAN SPIRIT.—We sincerely pray that the spirit breathed in the following remarks, by DR. TYNG, may abound among all professing christians.

At a missionary Jubilee at Williamtown, Mass., several weeks since, the chairman introduced one of the speakers, Dr. Stephen H. Tyng, with the remark, that they "were most happy to have a representative from that ancient Church, at whose altars our ancestors were baptised."

Dr. Tyng replied: "I am much obliged to you, sir, for your friendly notice of the Episcopal Church as the 'ancient Church.' But I do not appear in any sense before you as a representative of that Church. I much doubt whether I should be generally considered by them as a suitable representative of their body at any time, and particularly now. The Tyngs are rather at a discount there just now. But I trust I may come as a member and representative of that much more ancient Church, the elect, spiritual Church of the Lord Jesus, established in the ancient settlements of his own covenant; that Church which excludes none who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; that Church which embraces all in every nation who fear God and work righteousness."

BELIEVETH.—Mr. James Ruthven, of N. York, not long before his death recited slowly, emphatically, and with great weakness of voice: "'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.' What a contrast!" said he; "there is none in the universe like it. What vast consequences hinge on the question! *Believeth!* I would like to see that word printed in capitals. How simple and easy it is; and yet how many refuse to believe, and perish. Unbelief is the only sin which the Gospel does not meet. For this, it has no cure. 'Ye will not come to me that ye might live.'"—*Ch. Advocate.*

Civil law saith the murderer shall be hung; but he dies before his conviction, or after his conviction before the day fixed for his execution; but he is not made alive on that day to be hung. You say—"No, for the executive officers have not power to restore his life." Well, suppose they had such power, what would be thought of them if they should revive the dead criminal to take away the life they had restored? Could it be looked upon in any other light than as an act of barbarism or revenge?

MINISTERING SPIRITS.

FROM M. C. ALLEN, BLACK ROCK.

Br. Storrs,—I send the enclosed for publication in the "EXAMINER," if after perusal, you should think it might subserve the cause of truth. How many times have we heard it reiterated, that our departed friends are our guardian angels; and belief which has not a particle of truth upon which to rest. Thus I *once* thought, because older and more advanced Christians, advocated it. It was in yearspast, when *all* the *church* taught it and believed it was Christ's teaching.—Blessed be His name, He I trust, has taught me now to resort to the law and the testimony, to settle every question of my faith. I confess that in times past, unconsciously almost, I have uttered petitions to the dear departed! and was surprised at the time upon reflection, assured that it was sin, and unscriptural. Two professors, the other evening, were expressing their firm belief, that our departed friends were about our path. I had to combat them, which I did by first asking, what authority they could bring from Scripture? and if our departed were cognizant of us daily, how could it be, but that they must often be pained? Oh! is it not consolation sufficient, to satisfy the Christian, what God has given us in his word? "They are asleep in Jesus." "They shall appear with Him in glory." "It shall be well with the righteous," &c. &c.

Should you give the enclosed (which was taken from the New York Evangelist last week) a place, perhaps it might be more conclusive, or rather influential upon some minds, than if written by an advocate of our doctrines. I can respond to all the sentiments of the writer, excepting of course, the consciousness of those who are asleep; whom our Lord will awaken as He did Lazarus; when He shall call, "they shall hear the voice of the Son of God." That one who appears such a correct thinker, and whose sentiments on this subject, seem to accord with Scripture, should not see clearly the *whole* truth—is to me, most wonderful. Why is it that blindness in part, still rests on so large a portion of Israel? One with whom a short time since I was conversing, relative to our views of truth, observed, "I think all on your side study the Bible most thoroughly, which Christians generally do not." Quite a concession I thought.

Do Departed Saints Become Ministering Spirits?

A writer in a recent number of the EVANGELIST maintains the affirmative; and in the June No. of that able and valuable periodical, the *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, is a grave article advocating the same view.

But is it true? And what are the tendencies of the doctrine? That angels are employed as ministering spirits, is admitted as a Bible doctrine, abundantly taught, and the practical influence of which is good. But the reasons advanced in support of the doctrine that the spirits of departed saints are also employed as ministering to those yet in this world, appear to the writer of this, weak and unsatisfactory. First, in regard to the argument from "the light of reason," or what is called the reasonableness of the doctrine. While the saints made perfect are in some respects like the angels, in other respects they are essentially unlike them. They are of a different and lower order of beings, and are inferior in respect to their faculties, their manners, their knowledge, and consequently in the ability, to minister to those in this world of trial and temptation, and sin, and affliction, and death, in a way to benefit them. While the very connection which they have had with the affairs of this world from which they have so recently departed, would naturally serve, at least in the great majority of instances, still farther to unfit them for this important work.

Nor do the arguments, drawn from the Bible in support of the doctrine, appear any more valid. It will not be pretended that it is anywhere directly taught, unless the saints are included, according to Scripture usage, under the appellation of angels. But of this there is no good evidence. The distinction would seem to be carefully kept up throughout the Bible, between saints and angels. The Saviour, it is true, speaking of the saints, says, Mat. 22: 30, "In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are *as* the angels of God in heaven." And again, Luke 20: 36, "Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels"—literally, "equally angels"—though the meaning evidently is that they are so in the respects mentioned; viz: their not being subject again to death, and their not marrying, or being given in marriage, like the angels. And there is nothing therefore in these passages which either warrants the conclusion that saints are ever included under the appellation of angels, so that what is affirmed of angels may be considered as affirmed also of them; or which implies that saints are endowed with the nature, or elevated to the rank, or called to the peculiar employments of angels.

Of the other passages summoned to the support of this doctrine, two only appear worthy of any notice. One is that where Moses and Elias are represented as visiting this world, conversing with the Saviour, and known to the three Apostles.—"And if," it is asked, "these two departed saints visited our globe, on this errand, why not on another errand? And if this be true in one instance, why may it not be true of the saints in numberless instances?"

The event of this visit of these two distinguished saints from the celestial world, is plainly represented as a peculiar and extraordinary one.—There was much that was miraculous connected

with it. They came not to minister to the disciples, but to converse with the Lord himself of the decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem, and to furnish in this way a practical demonstration of the truth that between Moses, and the Prophets, and Christ there is no disagreement, that all are in harmonious concurrence.—The occasion on which they came was an extraordinary one; such as never before had been, and never will occur again. And from this visit, in an extrardinary manner, and on an extraordinary occasion, to the Lord himself, but a short time before His death, it cannot be justly inferred that glorified saints generally are accustomed to act as tutelary spirits, to guard and minister to Christ's disciples in the world.

The last, and perhaps the strongest passage in support of this doctrine is that in Rev. 22 : 6–9. When John fell down to worship the angel, he was told, "See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow servant and of thy brethren the prophets, and of those that keep the sayings of this book, worship God." This language is only what this exalted being, whom John mistook for a divine being, might naturally and properly have used upon supposition that he was a real angel. When John would have worshipped him, "No," says he, "I am not a proper object of your worship. I am myself only a servant and a worshipper of Jehovah, like yourself, and your brethren the prophets, and those who keep the sayings of this book.—Worship God."

It is only what an angel might have said with as much propriety as any saint redeemed and glorified; and of course affords no evidence that this was an instance of a mortal become an angel, and their coming on an errand to our world; much less that saints are generally accustomed to come as ministering spirits to their friends or others yet in the world. The doctrine then, we must regard as a fiction, unsubstantiated by any evidence either from reason or Scripture.

TENDENCIES OF THE DOCTRINE.

It is seldom safe, often dangerous to adopt as articles of religious belief, doctrines not found in the Bible, or plainly inferable from its teachings. The one before us, we think, is no exception.—The Bible contains enough for the instruction and edification, and comfort, of God's children, without the necessity of resorting to such baseless fictions. It were a higher honor for mortals, and to my mind, much more cheering and encouraging, to be ministered unto by those exalted and glorious beings called angels, than to enjoy merely the ministry of fellow beings of our own comparatively feeble race, who have but recently left their clayey tabernacle, and have not yet had time to attain any great eminence, in knowledge, or wisdom or power. There are no doubt other employments, in which the just made perfect in heaven may be engaged, as honorable, and to which they will be quite as well fitted, as that of ministering to their friends surrounded with the darkness, and temptations, and dangers of this world, from which they have barely escaped through divine grace.

As to any motives to holiness which the doctrine is supposed to present. There are motives sufficient presented in the Bible. And he who does not find in the consideration that he is under the inspection of high and holy angels, whose ministry it is his privilege to enjoy, and especially that the eyes of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are ever upon him, "a stimulus to high and holy living," would be little likely to feel such a stimulus from the belief that departed Christian friends whom he hath known only in their imperfection, are near, noticing all that he thinks and does.

In regard to its alleged tendency to comfort surviving friends of the pious dead. We are not left to such a doubtful source of comfort. The word of God presents numerous and more substantial sources of comfort to all who are entitled to receive comfort. While some perhaps might derive a kind of satisfaction from the belief that their departed friends are still near, and knowing all about them—to reflecting minds generally, I apprehend, it would minister neither comfort, nor satisfaction. I once heard a ministerial brother remark, over the corpse of his departed companion—how much more comforting to him was the thought that the spirit of the loved one was now in heaven, there to continue, participating in its joys, and employments, until his own time should come, to be called home to that abode of the redeemed, than would be the thought that, according to a quite common notion, she was still hovering around, without any definite, or fixed place of abode.

But my last and strongest objection to this doctrine is, its tendency to superstition, with which it is very nearly allied. If it be true, that "departed spirits are about us, conscious of our circumstances, suggesting thoughts to our minds, and seeking our good, though veiled from our sight," then how natural that we should present to them our requests, and invoke their influence in our behalf in heaven, as the Romish Church are accustomed to do. The practice of praying to the saints is neither unscriptural or absurd.—And if they are thus near us, how natural and reasonable also to suppose that they would if possible, devise some method whereby to make known to mortals their presence and hold communication with them. The principles and practices of those who are carried away with the spirit rapping delusion, as well as the superstitious and idolatrous practice of praying to saints adopted by the Romish and other Oriental Churches, are only the natural and legitimate results of a belief in the doctrine we have been considering.

We must therefore consider the doctrine not only as destitute of any support, but as positively evil in its tendency and influence. R. M.

From Wm. M. Ross, Weston, C. W.

Br. Storrs.—As some of your subscribers have expressed their opinion on the question that has been so much discussed (i. e. the resurrection of the wicked dead,) you will I hope not be offended if I also express mine. After paying the greatest

attention to what has been said on both sides of the question, I cannot agree with either; but I think that the truth lies between two extremes.—In the first place, that text in John 5: 28, 29, speaks so positive of "the resurrection of life." and "the resurrection of damnation" that I feel bound to believe it, especially as Paul confesses that he believed in a "resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust, Acts 24: 15." Then again, on the other side of the question I do not see any thing in that text, or any other that teaches me to believe that all the wicked dead who have ever lived since Adam must rise in the resurrection of damnation. On the contrary it is clear, that the Lord judged the old world in the days of Noah, and executed judgment upon all the wicked of that age; and surely a just God will not punish twice for one transgression. It is also the same with the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomarrah; the Lord came down and judged them, and they suffered the vengeance of eternal fire once. Must they suffer it again? I think not; for Jesus said, it should be more tolerable for them than for the cities in which he preached. But how can that be if the Sodomites must rise and suffer again? If the Sodomites do not rise, then we can see how it is more tolerable for *them*, if they have nothing more to suffer, than for those who have to rise and suffer the vengeance due to their crimes. But if both have to rise and to suffer alike, then the reverse must be the case. In short, I think that whenever any of Adam's race have died under the infliction of any judicial punishment for their sins, as was the case of the Old World, in the days of Noah, the inhabitants of Sodom and the cities of the plain, in the days of Lot, the Egyptians, whom the Lord overthrew in the Red Sea, and Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and all that company whom the Lord caused to be swallowed up by the earth opening her mouth and swallowing them up, and all the wicked in every age who have received *from the* LORD judicial punishment for their sins, *they will not rise*, for the Lord's anger towards them "has ceased" in their destruction. But the wicked who have fared sumptuously, like Dives, and robbed the poor; and died comfortably in their beds, and were buried perhaps with great pomp; and all who have not received from God's hand a due recompense for their deeds must arise again, for God will "by no means clear the guilty."

May the Lord grant that you and I, dear Brother, may receive the forgiveness of all our sins, though Jesus Christ our Lord, in the day of his appearing, together with all his saints. Amen. I remain your Brother in Christ,

WM. M. ROSS.

From M. C. Allen.

I am glad the discussion—"Will the wicked dead be made alive?"—has closed; because with you, I think all the arguments on both sides have been exhausted. I have no regret that it has been discussed. It will lead thinking minds to search, that they may know what God the Lord has spoken in relation to the end of sinners. As for myself, I have thought much upon the subject (since it has been brought forward:) connected it with prayer, that I might not believe an error regarding it. The result is, that I am more confirmed in the belief, that as many of them *enjoy* all that their hearts wish in this life, realizing *no wrath*, "they are reserved for the day of wrath, and righteous indignation;" for they must be made to see, *what* they have lost, and weep and wail, ere their miserable existence becomes extinct.

I cannot close without expressing my regret, and even disappointment, in not receiving an "EXAMINER" the first inst. One was, I thought, as much as your subscribers should expect in August, as we had such an amount of precious reading, in the arguments reviewed of Post's. I think I have received more sound scriptural instruction from the EXAMINER, since I became a subscriber, than from any other religious periodical to which I have subscribed;—and I believe I may say in truth, any of the books (and they are not a few,) that I have ever read professing biblical teaching. I do want to hear from friends abroad, professing like precious truths. Do you receive any communications from them, these days?

That the Lord may lengthen your days, and strengthen you more and more, to advocate His revealed truth, is the prayer of

Your friend, looking for eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Black Rock, September 9th.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—We thought our friends understood that the *Review* of Dr. Post, which we sent to all our paying subscribers, was in lieu of four regular EXAMINERS. That being our statement, we presumed they would look for only *one* each month for the four months following that issue. We find, however, that several have misunderstood us. The regular *twice* a month issue may be looked for in November and Decemher.

From Samuel Mason, Conn.

Br. Storrs,—It is not to bid you "Farewell" that I write. No, the EXAMINER and its *Editor* are too precious to part with on any such easy terms. I would much rather say, make me a visit *every week*, although you may advance some views which do not exactly coincide with my own; and peradventure you may undermine some theory that is cherished by me as a sweet morsel. But still I am willing, at any time, to lay down fifty errors for one truth. Truly, dear Brother, I did think I had the truth on my side, when I believed the wicked would have a resurrection from amongst the dead, TO LIFE. But I must confess, you have almost persuaded me to believe, that those who have not Christ formed within, the hope of glory, "shall not see life;" and to exclaim with the Psalmist of old, "thou *hast* rebuked the heathen, thou *hast* destroyed the wicked, thou *hast* put out their names for ever and ever," Ps. 9: 5. Their names are blotted out of the book of remembrance spoken of by Malachi 3: 16; they have passed away, and lo they are not. "Yea, I sought them, but they could not be found." Or, as Job says, "The dwelling place of the wicked

shall come to naught;" or as it reads in the margin, "*not be.*" So if the Lord keeps no book of remembrance of the wicked, and they have no place to exist in, how can God find them if they have perished out of existence? Or, where has God promised that he would bring the wicked dead again *to life?*—*Where?* The word of God tells me—"The soul that sinneth, *it shall die*"—"it shall *not live.*"—"The wages of sin is *death;*" not death and a resurrection to life; for Jesus says, "I am the resurrection and the life,"—"he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live;" John 11: 25: Then they must believe in Jesus, or they cannot live. Do the wicked believe in Jesus?—*No.* Then how can they live again, if they are once dead? "They shall *not live,*" saith the Lord. But if the wicked should attain a resurrection to life, must it not be through their father the Devil? And I cannot see any possibility of it from that source, for he is a life destroyer, not a life giver. Besides, Jesus will destroy the Devil when he comes. Then they will not get life through the devil; and they cannot get life through Christ. Again, I ask where will they get their life? If they do get their life from Christ, they cannot die any more; for I read—"they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection of the dead, shall be equal to the angels"—can "DIE *no* MORE." Then if the wicked are accounted worthy to obtain unto the resurrection from the dead, they cannot die any more, but are immortal; thus we get "Universal Salvation!" "God says—the soul that sinneth it shall die," Amen.

In conclusion, dear Brother,—I would say, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good;" and "whatsoever thine hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might," until Jesus shall come, who has said, "*Occupy till I come.*" He has given you his word to guide you, and his Spirit to direct you; and has told you that all his word is profitable—that we must live by every word of God—that he is our Lord and Master. How then can you be circumscribed in your labors to the narrow limits of any human creed, oral or written? I would say to you, Take the whole length and breadth, the heighth and depth, the center and circumference of the word of God—the Book of Inspiration—as the field of your labors. And in this glorious field, I hope wherever the Lord shall direct, you will be found faithfully and joyfully *occupying* till Jesus shall come; then may you receive the blessing, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom," is the prayer of your unworthy patron.

From John Ferree, Lexington, Mo.

Br. Storrs,—I have before me a letter in which you are assailed, which I will send you, and you can answer for yourself. I will give you a brief history of the past, and the cause that brought the letter. It is well known to yourself that I have been a reader and supporter of the BIBLE EXAMINER ever since its first publication, which was before I came to this country. On coming to this place I found the "Christian Church," so called, or otherwise known as followers of Alex. Campbell, at war; two hostile parties, *viz.*, "majority and minority," arrayed against each other, ready at times to go into a street fight, and finally resulting in a separation, and a new organization "of the minority," which went by the name "of South Street Church." After being strongly solicited to become a member of that party, by laying aside my peculiar views, or holding them as private property, which I refused to do until they were proven wrong. But this they never undertook to do, but concluded to take me in as I was. After a few years this church on account of incessant quarreling fell through. I then became a regular attendant of the "North Street Church, or majority party." At length I was warmly solicited to join the Church by one of the Elders; ("Lords over God's heritage,) after reflecting for some time and again being solicited, I united with the party, without a dissenting voice, although my views were known to many of the Church. After being a member for more than two years, I was called on by another of the Elders, and again by three of them, requiring me to hold my views privately, or nothing but an expulsion from the Church would satisfy them. This was the only argument they could offer to show that I was wrong. The only chance of defence that I had left was, if possible, to secure a withdrawal letter, which was granted without the privilege of making any defence; a copy of which I will send you, as follows:—

"Whereas, John Ferree holds sentiments upon the final destiny of the wicked, and as to the state of the condition of the dead between death and the resurrection, different from the views of this church, and for which it has no fellowship, and to avoid difficulty and save all feelings upon the subject, he asks that his connection with the church be dissolved; which request is hereby granted, without prejudice to his moral character, as in that respect his standing among us is fair.

"A copy of an extract from the minute of the proceeding at a meeting of the Church of Christ, in Lexington, Mo., 3rd Lord's day in January, 1856. JOHN E. BASCOM, *Clerk.*"

By the above letter, it will be seen, that they are as truly sectarian and creedized as any other Church that can be found, notwithstanding their broad profession of taking "the Bible for their rule of faith and practice." A short time after this I sent a copy of the BIBLE EXAMINER, Vol. 8, No. 5, 1853, to Elder Allen Wright, "a Preacher of the Gospel of Christ" in the above named Church, accompanied by a note calling his attention to your article under the head of "the rich man and Lazarus," requesting him to examine the article and say whether it was the true exposition or not; and if not, to give me the true explanation of the figure. The following is the result, which I submit for your consideration.

Yours as ever in the hope of the Gospel,
JOHN FERREE.

LETTER OF ALLEN WRIGHT TO FERREE.

At Home, June 17th, 1856.

"*Friend Ferree,*—Some months since I received a number of a work styled "BIBLE EXAMINER, accompanied with a note from you requesting me to examine the Examiner, and to report my convictions, &c.

I find several items scored around with a pen, as I suppose to call my attention to those items. Among other items I find an exposition of the case of the rich man and Lazarus, given by the EDITOR. The rule laid down by MR. STORRS is a good one in general, *viz.*, to make the context assist in explaining the passage. The 17th verse is regarded by the editor, as the "Key" to unlock this passage. I do not think Mr. STORRS has followed the rule laid down by himself. Why lay hold of the 17th verse as the "Key" and entirely overlook the "context?" unless to support his fanciful and far-fetched interpretation. Why not make the 18th verse the "Key," as it stands in immediate connection?—The "context" to a man with an "eye single" clearly shows that our Lord aimed a blow at the sin of "covetousness," the *end* of which he portrays in the case of the "Rich man and Lazarus." Any other interpretation is a perversion of this deeply interesting passage, and the lesson designed to be taught by our Lord is lost upon Mr. Storrs' hypothesis. Judging from the contents of the work before me, Mr. Storrs' mission is, mainly, to demonstrate that man is but little, if any, superior to an ox, or an ass; and the number before me has about convinced me that he belongs to the latter class. To be candid with you, friend FERREE, the whole work smells so strong of the land of "wooden nutmegs," "patent bacon hams" and spirit rappings, that it is an unsavory dish to me; it may be suited to the palate of dyspeptics, but will be repudiated by those of healthy minds. Solomon, the King of Israel, lived a long time ago, and may be regarded by many in this age of progress as an old "fogy," but he uttered many plain, home truths? Among others the following, see Prov. 26: 7. "The legs of the lame are not equal; so is a parable in the mouth of fools." Thus have I briefly but candidly given you my convictions on the premises as you requested me in your note. I have been quite unwell for several days with "bad cold" and I am very nervous. Please excuse this scribble, wishing you health, mercy, and peace. I am respectfully yours,

ALLEN WRIGHT.

The above letter is a true copy of the original.

JOHN FERREE.

—

NOTE BY ED. EXR.—We do not think Mr. WRIGHT needs any reply from us. That he is a "*dyspeptic*" is a self-evident truth. No doubt he is "*very nervous*" and "*quite unwell*," and that he has a "*bad cold*" is also clear. He seems afraid he may be thought an "ox or an ass;" and to prove he is not, he is quite disposed to admit the Editor of the EXAMINER is "the latter;" forgetting that such a very modest epithet towards one of Adam's posterity convicts himself of no distant relationship to the despised "animal." How exceeding appropriate for his private meditation and use are the words of one of the lawyers to Jesus—"Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also." See Luke 11: 44, 45. If he has any self-respect left, we trust he will not write again till his "nervous" excitement has abated.

The following is Br. Ferree's reply to Mr. Wright's letter.

Reply to Allen Wright.

BY JOHN FERREE.

Lexington, Mo., July 10, 1856.

Friend Wright,—Your note of the 17th, was received in due time. I was much surprised at receiving it at so late a date, and still more so when I saw the arguments you made use of to convince me of the error into which you think I have fallen. They are so strong I will not attempt to refute them; they are too carnal. I did not think a Preacher of the Gospel of Christ would deal in such stuff; really, I did not think the queries I made needed any such ridicule and burlesque, or that I should be called a fool or pronounced a dyspeptic. Surely, friend Wright, you have forgotten the precepts and examples of your Master and his apostles; one of the precepts is, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," if I have fallen "among thieves and robbers," and you like the "Levite pass by on the other side" and cast contempt and ridicule into the "wounds and bruises," instead of the "wine and oil" of the Gospel—"*to the law and testimony*, if they *speak not according* to this *word*, it is because there is no light in them."—But mark the words you speak. They are not to be found in "the law" or "the testimony." Again, the testimony says, "if thine enemy hunger feed him, if he thirst give him drink; naked clothe him," by so doing ye shall heap coals of fire on his head. But what is the food you and the church gave me to eat? It is, "fool"—"dyspeptic," "he is crazy, mad, and not fit to talk to." These and such like are the arguments used against me; just such language as the "Scribes and Pharisees" used to Christ and his Apostles. If I am wrong, why revile me? re-vilings never convinced any man, and never will.—The words of Paul to Timothy, do not say, revile them, but "teach them with sound words and doctrine, that you stop the mouth of gainsayers, that the word of God be not blasphemed." But what is your teaching? If I am capable of judging, it amounts to little less than blasphemy, instead of the words of Christ which are "peace and love." If I am a "dyspeptic" (as you intimate in your letter) it is trying to digest some of the food you have from time to time given me from the pulpit: some of which was so hard I could not even chew it; and of course it brings on "dyspepsie." I will name some of those hard articles of food. 1st.—The idea of God all wise and just casting sinners into "hell," or purgatory, (I cannot call it by any other name) and tormenting them for thousands of years until "the day of judgment," and then taking them out of hell, and judging them, and casting them back again; working an eternal miracle to keep them alive in "endless sin and sufferings," in the face of the positive declaration of his word, "All the wicked will God *destroy*"—"And the day that cometh shall *burn them up*, saith the LORD

of Hosts; that it shall leave them *neither root nor branch*." How to reconcile the torment of the sinner through innumerable ages, with the character of God and his word is more than I can digest. 2d. You have asserted from the pulpit that "David's Throne was translated to Heaven," without giving one ray of evidence how this great wonder could have been overlooked and no history or record of the fact, and be left for the mere presumption of yourself, is something I am not capable even of chewing. 3rd. You said in a discourse, from the text where Paul says, "we wrestle not with flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers and spiritual wickedness in high places," (I quote from memory,) you stated that this "spiritual wickedness was the wicked spirits of dead men floating about in the air with which we had to contend." This is a hard dose, and cannot be digested except by "*those of healthy minds*." And I think they should not say one word against "spirit rapping," but should join that party; for if they are floating about in the air, and we have to contend with them, I do not see why they may not rap, kick, overturn tables, &c. I do think that my friend Wright, after all this presumption, ought to deal in "wooden nutmegs, patent hams, and spirit rapping." And as you have assailed my much beloved Brother STORRS, with whom I am personally acquainted, and from whom I have taken sweet c unsel, as being an "ass," as you have stated, I will hand your letter over to him, and let him answer for himself. And if he cannot bray as loud and long as some of his *brothers*, he can, at least, bray to as good purpose. The above may seem severe, and if it does, I have only followed the example of a (professed) preacher of the Gospel of Christ.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN FERREE.

From W. B. Wade, Indiana.

Br. Storrs,—It will be a pleasure to me at all times to do what I can to sustain your valuable paper, but there is such an amount of prejudice here in the minds of many that they can neither be induced to hear or read any thing on the subject of our blessed hope. One reason for this is, we have so many Isms here, of all kinds, that the people have no desire to know anything else. We have Methodism, Presbyterianism, Baptist-ism, Universalism, Catholicism, and I do not know how many other Isms, and among all the rest we have a good deal of spiritualism. So you see that in such a community it is hard to do much for the Bible and its truth: nevertheless there are a few even in this place who are willing to take their stand on the Bible, and the Bible alone; and who have moral courage to advocate its truth, and the doctrine it teaches. We are well united and have preaching occasionally by Br. S. A. Chaplin, and Br. French. I thank you for the book you sent me a short time since, *viz.*, your Review of Dr. Post on the Destiny and Immortality of man. I think it is an excellent work, and will do good.

Reply No. 4 to Macknight, Jr.

BY HENRY GREW.

It is necessary for me to correct a misapprehension of my brother M. If he and our readers will please review my articles, it may be perceived, that although I have argued for a reference to "the dead" *in general* in Luke 20: 37, 38, ("for ALL live unto him,") *this is not the main point of my "confidence."* The subject of that confidence, which is *undiminished*, is that our Lord's conference with the Sadducees on this occasion, gives no sanction to the sentiment of my brother's paraphrase of the non-resurrection of the wicked. The intelligemt reader will perceive the difference between the passage "*not proving* the re-living of the wicked dead," and *disproving* it. If this passage proves the resurrection of the righteous only, other passages adduced by me as clearly prove the resurrection of the wicked. It remains for my respected friend to reconcile these divine testimonies with his views. I assure him he has much to accomplish yet before he will realize his expectation of seeing Br. Grew "abandon the doctrine of the revival of the wicked dead." He has, as yet, but entered on the threshold of the subject. As for his "confidence in the potency of truth," this is a two-edged sword, and may yet slay brother M's. present opinion. I leave the reader to estimate the value of the representation, that if he happens to agree with Br. Grew he must be *prejudiced*.

Our brother wishes to know what I believe to be the true import of the two verses, Luke 20: 37, 38. In reply, I remark that to ascertain "the true import" of any passage of divine revelation, it is necessary to compare it with other passages relating to the same subject. Scripture is its own interpreter.

"Now that the dead are raised," &c. *What dead?* The previous verses clearly teach that the *righteous* dead will be raised, and *on this ground*, they now are considered as living to God in the 38th verse; which declares that "ALL live unto him." Now if the true prophet of God had given us no other instruction on the doctrine of the resurrection than we find in this conference with the Sadducees, the word "ALL" in ver. 38 might be considered as limited to the righteous, but as the Saviour has plainly and unequivocally affirmed in John 5: 29, a resurrection of the wicked, and as it is on the ground of a resurrection that the righteous dead live unto God, I am inclined to consider the word "all" in the 38th ver. and the word "dead" in the 37th as general, referring to both classes. I am not positive however that this is the fact, although I see no impropriety in our Saviour first affirming the resurrection of the righteous and then of *all* the dead. To consider "the true import" as denying his positive testimony in John 5: 28, 29, and the plain testimony of the inspired apostle, that there shall be "a resurrection both of the just and unjust," and that of innumerable similar passages, I am confident is unwarrantable.

All that remains for me at present is to "harmonize" my views with 2 Tim. 1: 10. The passage affirms the glorious truth that our blessed Lord "hath abolished death and brought life and immortality

to light," which we mutually believe is the exclusive privilege of the righteous. "If this be so, (our brother remarks) and the wicked are not to be immortal, it follows that death will hold in its grasp all who are not 'asleep in Christ.'" As well might he say, that because the tiger, who is determined on the destruction of his prey, has temporarily let go his hold to "grasp" with increased firmness, will fail of his purpose. The revelation of "the second death" solves the difficulty. Rev. 20 : 14. HENRY GREW.

Important Questions.

MELTONSVILLE, Anson County, N. C., Sept. 1856.

Dear Brother:—Positive testimony that the wicked dead will be made alive remains unquoted, unannounced. The reason is obvious: it is not in the Bible. The phrase "resurrection of the unjust," and the words "made alive," are not used synonymously.

The discussion has been carried to considerable length. I have not read one solitary passage from scripture, saying, "*the wicked dead will be made alive.*" Is faith the offspring of evidence—the gift of God? Where is the evidence given by God, that he will raise the wicked dead and make them alive? Will He raise the dead—make them alive and wicked? Will he create wickedness and perpetuate it—eternize it? Is He the creator of sin, or rather, will He create sin? It seems to me that there is something horrible, if not blasphemous, in the idea that God will make the wicked *dead alive—as wicked, living beings—a New Creation!* What meaning is affixed to "*made alive?*" If God had at first created Adam as a *wicked, sinful*, corrupt, and polluted being, would it be less or more a creation of wickedness, than to *make alive* unnumbered wicked beings who are dead—know nothing, have ceased to sin—and have suffered the penalty of the law, *death*—returned to the dust? Will the works of the devil never be destroyed?—Will wicked beings be made out of the ashes of the wicked dead? But, why ask so many questions? Will the resurrection of the unjust be a *revival* of wickedness? What a stupendous *Revival?* And who, in that case, would be the great Revivalist? By whose power would the awful revival be wrought? The power of God? What! The Revivalist of wickedness? Have these queries no immediate connection with the affirmative of the question—"Will the wicked dead be made alive?" Or are they its sequences? Some call the conversion of sinners a revival of religion, while the members of the church, to which they may be added, are baptised in avarice, extortion, hatred, malice and evil speaking,—but, whoever read of the Revival of sin and wickedness as the *sole* act of God? Will any one try their *Logic* or *Hermeneutics* on these questions? Positive testimony is required—not human testimony, for this is, how erroneous soever, too apt to be positive.

Do the wicked dead commit sin? Is sin among the works of the devil? If by the revival of the wicked, sin is revived, whose work is it?—Does the devil raise the dead? Is he the resurrection of the wicked dead? It is best neither to go beyond revelation, nor to lead those, who have already transcended its limits, any farther into the regions of fancy.

I have asked many questions which might be comprised in one. But the reason I did so, is quite obvious. Other questions equally pertinent might be asked by the Universalist, who could easily assign weighty *reasons* to show that whatever God creates is *good*, that whatever he makes alive is holy. Perhaps brethren are approaching Universal Salvation by maintaining that God will revive the wicked dead, and make them alive.—Nous verrous. J. F. L.

Extract from a Private Letter.

I have had *two* long discussions on the Immortality question with the new Methodist preacher here. You can guess with what results. He professes to be "posted" in regard to our theory; but the *fact* is, he does not understand its first principles. On Monday evening I kept him in my study till after ten o'clock. Among other absurdities, he took the ground that God was *as well pleased* with the endless misery of the finally impenitent as he was with the salvation of the righteous!!! In vain did I urge against this horrible and blasphemous imputation the thrice-repeated declaration of the Most High, that He has "NO *pleasure* in the *death* of the wicked," &c. He also declared, over and over again, that if he believed in the destruction of the wicked, he would cease at once to lead a religious life, and would join the ungodly multitude in the pursuit of the pleasures of sin! Oh, my soul! are these the men, and these the sentiments, to save the perishing! I told him it followed from his assertion, that his *only* motive for serving God was the fear of eternal torment; but this, very inconsistently, he denied.

Our Brother after writing the foregoing, attended a funeral in another town; after mentioning that "not a single word of allusion to the doctrine of the resurrection" was made, adds—

I must tell you of *one* truthful utterance in the funeral sermon. In addressing the mourners, the preacher (Methodist) said that if they had to believe the deceased was among the "lost," the thought would be enough to "DETHRONE REASON." Precisely so. And still they go on proclaiming endless torments for deathless souls. The Methodist preacher here yesterday morning discoursed from—"We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." He said there were *only two kinds of death* mentioned in the Bible. The one was that which the Bible (???) defined as being the "separation of the soul from the body." The other was "*spiritual death,*" which he said was the present, and would be the eternal condition of the sinner. (That is to say, the sin and the punishment are one and the same thing! O, the consistency of orthodoxy!)

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, NOVEMBER 1, 1856. NO. 21.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year;

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"THE COVENANTS."

BY HENRY GREW.

Dear Brother Storrs.—While I sincerely thank our brother CAMPBELL for many excellent remarks on the Covenants, I am obliged to dissent from him in some particulars.

I do not know what he means by the affirmation that "there must be an end to the plan of salvation, through faith: for faith is the confidence of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. But when seen, faith is no longer in exercise,—Salvation *then* must depend on obedience, as before the fall." If he had not added the last remark, I should suppose he referred to the glorified state, subsequent to all human probation. During this probation I see no scriptural evidence for salvation for any man but "through faith."

I understand, with brother C., that "the new covenant of Jerh. 31: 31," has, *in that place*, exclusive reference to the house of Israel, to be fulfilled at their future gathering. I understand however, that this covenant *is* "the gospel covenant, the mystery which Paul was made a minister of," though our brother thinks "it cannot be." To prove this he refers us to Eph. 3: 1–6, and remarks, that "it will be seen, that no gospel covenant with Gentiles was revealed to the old prophets; but that the Gospel to the Gentiles was a mystery (*i. e.* secret) which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men." "Now the apostle does not say that no gospel covenant with Gentiles was revealed to the old prophets," but that "in other ages was not made known to the sons of men AS it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel." The import of which is, that it was not made known to men in general, nor even to the old prophets *in the same full and clear manner*, as at the coming of our blessed Lord.—This construction I will now sustain by scriptural facts.

Gal. 3: 8. "And the scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, *saying*, In thee shall all nations be blessed." "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is CHRIST. And this I say that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect." verses 16, 17.—Here "the gospel covenant" was revealed to Abraham four hundred and thirty years before "the law" or Sinaic covenant.

The same glorious covenant of favor to the fallen and guilty children of men was revealed to the prophet Isaiah. "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious." 11: 10. See the entire chapter, also chap. 42. "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thy hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles." See also Dan. 7: 14, Malachi 1: 11, &c. Thus did the prophets, by the Holy Spirit of God, testify the same truth announced by good old Simeon when he took the infant Savior in his arms, declaring him to be Jehovah's salvation "prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel." Luke 2: 32. So Peter declared. See 1 Peter 1: 10, 11, 12.

If "no gospel covenant with Gentiles was revealed to the old prophets," it follows, that no Gentile sinner will ever be saved, for there is no other covenant of eternal life, or salvation from everlasting death, than that revealed to Abraham and "confirmed before of God in Christ," even four hundred and thirty years before the law. Indeed this covenant of wondrous love and mercy was announced in the presence of Adam in the words to the serpent; "and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." Gen. 3: 15.

I thank my dear brother for maintaining the great and glorious truth that "God, more merciful than the Gentiles, has promised to make a new covenant with the house of Judah and Israel," "and to set his hand the second time to restore them." His denial, however, that there is "any fore-ordination or irrevocable decree in all this," is marvellous indeed! I ask, what is the difference between an *absolute unconditional* declaration that *in the future* God will write in their hearts, &c., and an "*irrevocable decree*" that he will do so? "Conditional prophecy (our brother remarks) is a twin pseudo to the never dying soul; they are both traditions of men." In the above declaration God foretells, or prophesies, what he will do in the future. It is the unconditional determination to give the disposition to repent and believe the truth,

without which indeed there is no salvation. It is as unconditional as "A virgin shall conceive and bear a son."

Our brother understands by the text "until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in," "the end of gospel probation," *i. e.* of the Gentiles. He distinguishes between "gospel probation" and the probation with which the Jews will be subsequently favored. I do not understand this. Are not the Jews to be saved by the Gospel? To my astonishment he affirms that "Jacob cannot be the converts to Christianity, because his ungodliness is to be turned away after the happy state of the christian is secured." Will he please to inform us then, by what other Name under heaven Jacob can be saved? This is all wrong. When the Jews are grafted into the same olive tree with Gentile christians, they will be "converts to christianity." Ungodliness is to be turned away from Jacob" long *before* "the happy state of (all) christian (Gentiles) is secured." So the inspired apostle plainly teaches. "Now if the fall of them (the Jews) be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness?" *i. e.*, how much more shall their conversion to God, be the means of the conversion of the Gentiles? This sense is confirmed by the 15th verse. "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" *i. e.*, to "the world." Then shall the prophetic word be fulfilled, "ALL NATIONS shall serve him." Ps, 72 : 11. The converted Jew will be instrumental in its glorious accomplishment. "Blindness in part is happened to Israel until" the commencement of this glorious era," until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in," *i. e.*, until the commencement of the period of the fulness of salvation to the Gentile world, when all the kingdoms of this world shall become "the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

Paul, brother C. says, "places the coming of the Deliverer, and the covenant of Jeremiah at the end of the gospel dispensation." When, where, or how does the apostle do this? No proof is given. That "the Gospel dispensation" is to end at the second coming of our blessed Lord, is one of the errors of the popular sects. It diminishes the revealed fruits of redeeming love a hundred fold, for it is not until he comes in the clouds of heaven that all nations will bow down before him and serve him. See Dan. 7 : 13, 14. The gospel dispensation will continue in the age to come, triumphing gloriously when Satan is bound. Rev. 20.

If the covenant of Jeremiah is not fulfilled until the end of the gospel dispensation, it will never be fulfilled at all, for it is only by faith in the gospel that perishing men become the children of God, which is the great blessing of that covenant. See Gal. 3 : 26. "One party (it is affirmed) cannot make a covenant." The term covenant is used in the sacred scriptures with considerable latitude of import. The covenant of Jeremiah 31 : 31–34 was the absolute determination, or purpose, or decree of God *alone*. Hence its infallibility. It secures the performance of man's repentance and faith, (which are conditions of salvation, *in a certain sense*,) by God's unconditional and absolute determination to write his law on the heart. To suppose that the promise in that covenant is conditioned on man's previous repentance, is to suppose that God promises to write his law on his heart, after man has written it there himself, and consequently does not need it to be done by the Almighty.

Indeed our brother himself, affirms that this covenant "cannot hang on any conditions of any people." Does it not follow then that it is a decree, and covenant of "one party" only?

Truly it is remarked, that "the gospel covenant is, in all its essential elements the Abrahamic covenant of grace, but I think my brother errs in not considering the covenant of Jeremiah 31 : 31, 34 also essentially the same. He remarks, "that the Gospel covenant cannot be made with any nation as a nation." Why not, if it were the purpose of God? However, Ezekiel 20th chapter plainly teaches, that although this covenant includes a great number of the literal house of Israel, it does not include them *all*, for at the future period when the elect are brought "into the bond of the covenant," v. 37. Some of Jacob's seed will be purged out, who "shall not enter the land of Israel."—vr. 38.

Very correctly our brother considers that there is no need of the God of salvation making any other covenant in the future with the house of Israel, than that which was made essentially with Abraham. Sinners of every age and dispensation are saved from eternal death by ONE covenant *only*, and by the ONE SEED of that one covenant only, "which is Christ." "The Gentiles adopting the Abrahamic faith," are saved by the very same covenant which is called "a *new* covenant," in contrast to the *old* Sinaic covenant, not because it had not, *in any manner*, been revealed before to any of the children of men, but because it has not yet been revealed to the house of Israel in general as it will be in the future, as the Sinaic covenant was revealed to them generally when God had brought them by Moses out of Egypt.

For this eternal covenant of infinite wisdom and love, by which a "a multitude which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds and people," shall enter in through the gates into the holy city, let our praises now and forever ascend to Him who sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb.

A GREAT SECRET—ALWAYS HAPPY.—"Why this constant happy flow of spirits?"

"No secret, doctor," replied the mechanic, "I have got one of the best of wives, and when I go out to work, she always has a kind word of encouragement for me, and when I go home she meets me with a smile, and she is sure to be ready; and she has done many things during the day that will please me, and I cannot find it in my heart to speak unkind to any body." What influence then hath woman over the heart of man, to soften it, and make it the fountain of cheerful emotions! Speak gently, then: a happy smile and a kind word of greeting, after the toils of the day are over cost nothing, and go far towards making a home happy and peaceful.

THE LANGUAGE OF PROPHECY

By George Duke of Manchester, England.

One of the principal difficulties in the language of prophecy, is the determination of the true limits of the literal, symbolical, and figurative. Perhaps we ought to commence a little earlier, and define the distinction between these three different styles. I would distinguish them thus:—If the language is used in its proper sense, and the idea is conveyed immediately, this I understand to be literal; but though the language be used in its proper sense, if a mediate idea be conveyed, this I suppose to be symbolical; lastly, if the idea conveyed is immediate, but the language is not used in its proper sense, this I apprehend is figurative.

When the Lord says, "Foxes have holes and birds have nests," "fox" is used in its proper sense, and there is no mediate idea; thus the language is literal. But when He says, "Go and tell that fox," the language is used in its proper sense, but there is a *mediate* idea; the idea of a fox arises in the mind, and then by reflexion the attribute of a fox is made characteristic of Herod. This is symbolical. But when it is said the floods lift up their voice, or the deep utters its voice, the first idea that arises in the mind is of the ocean, but the language is used improperly; this is figurative.

Symbols are not suited for eloquence, being too cumbrous; the ideas are presented too slowly, which is the very reverse of figurative language; the metaphor in the one instance is applied to the noun, in the other to the adjective; the emotions are immediately roused by the figure, the ingenuity is first exercised in the symbol.

As it is admitted on all sides that no language is so literal as to be entirely devoid of figure, and no prophecies so strictly symbolical as to be without some passages purely literal, it might be supposed that the chief difference amongst students of prophecy, is mainly a question of degree as to how much is literal, symbolical, or figurative. This, however, is not at present the state of the case; that which was only a question of degree has diverged into two distinct and essentially different modes of interpretation, which the advocates of each opinion severally denominate literal and spiritual.

The literal or grammatical method is based upon the assumption that there are certain determinate ideas of things attached to certain words, and consequently, that the words are employed as the medium to convey the ideas which usage and custom have fixed and connected with those words. That it is, therefore, the duty of the interpreter to divest his mind of any preconceived ideas which may influence the meaning he would at tach tothe words, the ideas not being admitted as ingredients in fixing the meaning of the words, but, on the contrary, the words originating in the mind those ideas which usage has connected with them.

Those portions of the Scripture which are not prophetical convey the same definite ideas which usage has fixed in other writings. And when God has been pleased to reveal to man, and through the instrumentality of man, somewhat respecting future facts, why should we not judge of God's meaning and of the facts which He states, though still future, as we should of man's meaning and of the facts which he states when writing a history of the past? There is no necessary difference as to the mode of conveying the ideas of the future or the past. A history of the past may be sung in numbers, a prediction of the future may be without poetic ornament or figure; the only essential difference between a record of what has been, and a revelation of what shall be, is the divine foreknowledge, "which vieweth things which be not as though they were."

I will give an illustration: When our Lord spake of his rising from the dead, the disciples questioned "one with another what the rising from the dead could mean;" and again, when He had most explicitly declared that He was going to suffer, "they understood none of these things." The literalist contends, that whilst these assertions of our Lord were still prophecies, the disciples ought to have received the words according to their literal and grammatical meaning, just as much as that now they have become matter of history, all christians do receive them; and that no preconceived ideas respecting Messiah's abiding for ever, should have so possessed their minds, as to make the previous idea reflect back upon the meaning of the words, instead of permitting the words in the first instance to impress upon the mind those ideas they were calculated to convey.

This mode of interpretation is no doubt liable to abuse by the extreme of literality;—a man not perceiving the difference between the supernatural and the monstrous, may argue that, because a prediction that a virgin should conceive, has been literally fulfilled, therefore there shall be a beast with seven heads and ten horns; but with the generality of mankind "intuitive consciousness will lead us to decide whether resemblance of properties, or identity of substance be intended."

As to less obvious distinctions betw een literal symbolical, and figurative, there will be degrees of difference. "Some," says Waterland, "will fancy the plain and obvious sense, unreasonable and absurd;" the man that will fancy that which is plain and obvious to be unreasonable and absurd, must be himself deficient, either in reason or in faith; but we must not run into the error of supposing the obvious sense to be necessarily the literal sense; when our Lord calls Herod a fox, the sense is obvious, but not literal; some put a literal sense upon "This is my body," but there are many who deny that to be the obvious sense. Some have attempted rules for deciding between the literal, figurative, and symbolical; I think there is a certain fact and discernment in seizing the spirit of a passage which is superior to any rules that can rigidly be laid down.

The question of spiritual interpretation is more complicated; its advocates should more rigidly de fine its nature.

Often there is a covert assumption of superiority in the claim for spiritual interpretation, which surely is not correct; for if the literal be the mind of the spirit, that undoubtedly is the most spiritual; our invention is not more free from dross than God's truth. There is also an injustice in the assumption; "spiritual" is ostensibly opposed to

"literal," but the real opposite to "spiritual" is "carnal;" thus the claimant of spiritual views, whilst apparently opposing "literal," does covertly and unconsciously to his opponent, fix the stigma of "carnal" on that which is "literal."

Sometimes "spiritual" appears opposed to "material," upon which I will quote some excellent observations of Mr. Brown; he speaks of "some tincture of that morbid spiritualism which shrinks from the very touch of materialism, as though separation from it in every form would be the consummation of happiness. May not," says he, "the gnostic element—of the essential sinfulness and vanity of matter—be found lurking beneath it? Certainly, the glorified bodies, both of the Redeemer and the redeemed, derive their elements from the dust of this ground." And if it be no degradation for the Son of God to take it into his own person . . . if the dust of this ground is capable of becoming a "spiritual" and "glorious" meet vehicle for the perfected and beatified spirit, the sharer of its bliss in the immediate presence, and the instrument of all its activities in the service of God and the Lamb,"—there can be no essential sinfulness and vanity in matter.

I wish I could always approve as fully of Mr. Brown's sentiments; but among the many fallacies which lurk under the term "spiritual," as describing a peculiar mode of interpretation, one of its most dangerous forms is, as far as I know, peculiar to Mr. Brown. He supposes that the inspired prophets use an expression in one sense, but that the equally infallible apostles apply another meaning to the passage. If this be a sound canon of interpretation, instead of deriving any aid from the New Testament in fixing the direct and immediate scope of the old, it would be calculated to mislead us; instead of the context in the Old assisting us in discovering the recondite sense of the quotation in the New Testament, it would blind us.

Sometimes the "spiritual" amounts to nothing more than the undefined. "A spirit passed before my face" . . . "it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image [was] before mine eyes." Sometimes the spiritual means the allegorical, analogical, or anagogetical. The spiritual principle is, in fact, multiform, for its real intention and object is evasion. If the literal system is adopted, certain interpretations must be admitted; and this constitutes the essential difference between the two modes; in the spiritual method, the preconceived ideas form an ingredient in fixing the meaning of the words, instead of the words being the means of suggesting, or channel for conveying, the ideas.

Thus the real intention of spiritual interpretation, and that which is its essential characteristic, is its real danger, for the same principle may be applied to the setting aside of any truth. There is, in fact, an end put to "the assurance of understanding," for the certainty of interpretation is derived from some necessity of signification, and the necessity of signification in words consists in the connexion between the words and ideas which has been fixed and established by usage and custom.

"There cannot be a doubt," says Dr. Henderson, "that in proportion as sacred hermeneutics come to be more severely studied, and perversions of the word of God hereditarily kept up under the specious garb of spirituality and a more profound understanding of Scripture, are discovered and exposed, the necessity of abandoning such slippery and untenable ground will be recognised, and the plain, simple, grammatical, and natural interpretation adopted and followed."

The Millennium.

DEFINITIONS.

The study of unfulfilled prophecy is divided into two distincts heads. One, the doctrine concerning the future; the other, the order and series of those events which occur during this dispensation, as introductory to the next.

Passing events leave a very different impression upon the mind according to what the expectation of the final issue may be: they receive their hue from the clouds in the distant horizon. Those who expect the prevalence of the Gospel, see in the efforts of Missionary and Bible Societies, as in the rosy streaks of morn, the dawning of a day, lovely and serene; whereas, other who believe the year of the redeemed will be ushered in by the day of vengeance of our God, discern that the sky is not only red but lowering, and they expect "a day of darkness and of gloominess, of clouds and thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains." Hence, as the development expected has so great an influence upon the aspect of events which are in progress, the consideration of the end should be the first in order, as it is in importance.

It would be difficult to state all the different shades of opinion which are entertained respecting the future, but they may be classed under two principal heads:

Some expect a universal spread of the Gospel for a thousand years before the close of this dispensation, at the expiration of which they place the general resurrection and the day of judgment, when Jesus will come and cast the wicked into hell, take the righteous back with Him to heaven, and annihilate the earth.

The opposite opinion is that we are to expect the advent of our Lord at any time; that when He comes, He takes the throne of David, and reigns upon the earth for a thousand years; and the saints rise and reign with Him; during which time the power of Satan is entirely controlled; though at the end of the thousand years, the evil one will be loosed for a short time; after which the wicked shall be raised and judged; the saints removed to heaven, and the earth destroyed.

Before pronouncing any judgment respecting these two opinions, I will define what I understand to be intended in the first opinion by "a universal spread of the Gospel for a thousand years before the close of this dispensation."

The "universal spread of the Gospel" corresponds with the language of the prophet, who says, "*The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the* Lord as the waters cover the sea." When it is said, *this shall be for a thousand years, I do not*

believe the advocates of this view insist that it shall be for that exact time, neither more or less; for some make it to mean much more, others perhaps comprise the progress of the Gospel in this period. By saying it will be "before the close of this dispensation," I understand it to be supposed that this state of things will be brought about by means similar to those at present in operation; such as the preaching of the word and the distribution of the Scriptures; but that these efforts will be more enlarged, and probably much more extensively blessed, by an increased outpouring of the Holy Spirit; the change, however, being more or less gradual, not marked by a sudden and defined transition from one state to another, and without the intervention of any miraculous agency.

With regard to the second opinion, I must define what I understand by the expression, "The coming of the Lord;" as also the "expecting," or "looking for," that event; and lastly, the entire expression, "Expecting the coming of the Lord at any time."

By the expression, "the coming of the Lord," I understand the removal of the Lord, in his bodily presence, from the heavens to this earth. When the angel declares that the same Jesus who was taken into heaven, should so come, in like manner as the apostles had seen Him go into heaven, we must understand "going" and "coming" in an analogous sense, namely, the removal of the Lord's bodily presence from one place to another. If then, it undoubtedly sometimes has this meaning, why should not the word "coming," when applied to Christ, be as uniformly understood in its simple meaning as when applied to others? If any other than the common and natural sense of the words be affirmed, that uncommon meaning must be an exception, and it rests with those who maintain the peculiar view, to prove each particular instance.

When it is said, "certain came to Antioch *from* Judea," it is not thought necessary to prove that this denoted the removal of men in their bodily presence from one place to another. So in saying "we look for Christ *from* heaven," it is not necessary to prove that this expression implies a removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

Paul gave directions to Silas and Timotheus to come to him, and he *waited for* them at Athens; it would be unnecessary to set about proving that he expected their bodily presence; so, when it is said we *wait for* God's Son *from* heaven, we need not prove that we mean the removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

I must next define what I understand by the expressions "expecting," or "looking for," and "waiting for." They do not only imply loving the appearing, but they embrace something more; we might say, by way of illustration, that Rhoda loved the appearing of Peter, but she did not expect him, therefore she opened not the gate for gladness; but "the people [gladly] received Christ, *for they were waiting* for him."

That this is the natural and proper meaning of the expressions, may be gathered from their use on other occasions. The impotent folk around Bethesda were *waiting* for the moving of the waters; doubtless they wished for the appearance of the angel, but had they known that he would not have descended for a thousand years, they would not have been waiting. St. Paul, in like manner, "looked for," or expected Timothy to come with the brethren.

Now are we to suppose the sense of these expressions altered when applied to the advent of Christ. When Simeon *waited* for the consolation of Israel, it is clear that he supposed the advent was possible at any moment. In like manner when "all the people were *in expectation*, and mused in their hearts whether John was the Christ," surely it implies they were in expectation, because they supposed that the advent of Christ drew near.—John sent to ask Jesus whether he was Christ, or whether they should *look* for another; John looked for the Messiah, knowing that the time of his advent was at hand. So I understand, with respect to the second coming, the expressions "waiting for," and "looking for," do not admit of a meaning which would put the possibility of Messiah's return beyond the period of a natural life; but "expecting" implies not only a possibility, but a probability within that time.

When it is said, "We may be expecting the coming of the Lord at any time," I conceive we must distinguish "the coming of the Lord" from expressions denoting the moment of the revelation of Jesus Christ, or of the rapture of the saints; doubtless these events are part of the coming, but they are momentary. The coming, I apprehend, embraces a series of events.

This may be illustrated by the circumstances of the first advent. From what day should we date that event? Either from the annunciation to Zacharias, or to the Virgin; from the birth of John, or the day in which the Saviour was born; from the commencement of John's ministry, or the time when "Jesus himself began, being about thirty years of age?" Some might urge the time of the conception, or, at any rate, of the birth of Christ, and they might quote in support the prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold the Virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son." And surely they would say, when embraced by Simeon in the temple, according to revelation, and worshipped by the magi as true born king of the Jews, it must be acknowledged that the Lord Christ was come. Yet against this it might be advanced that the advent could not be dated before the ministry of John, because John was to "go before him," that is, in his ministry; for it was to be "in the spirit and power of Elias to turn the hearts of the fathers, &c." John therefore, in his ministry, speaks of Christ's advent as yet future. And as to the prophecies, it appears clear when Daniel speaks of Messiah the Prince, he refers to his entrance upon his public ministry.

How are we to reconcile these things? I think the fair answer would be, that the whole series of events must be embraced in "the coming of Christ." The first of them cannot be excluded from that category, yet the advent was not complete before the last. In some instances one event might be re-

ferred to, as when our Lord said, "The law and the prophets were until John;" that I apprehend related to the commencement of John's ministry: on other occasions there seems a delay until after the ministry of John was concluded; as, for example, when it is said, "Now, when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Gallilee," in order to fulfil Isa. ix. 1. 2.

In like manner, with respect to the second advent, it need not be limited to the moment in which the Lord shall be revealed as a flash of lightning, but may embrace a series of events issuing inevitably in that awful and glorious result. When that series shall commence is uncertain and contingent, and therefore known to no one but the Father: but this much negative information we may have; until the series does commence, we may know that the brightness of Christ's presence is not impending; and, on the other hand, when the series shall begin, we may expect that all will be quietly accomplished, although the particular hour when the elect shall be caught up to meet the Lord will even then be unknown. When, therefore, it is said that we are to expect the coming of Christ at any time, I conceive the commencement of a series of events, having relation to the progress of the Lord, and terminating in the revelation of Jesus Christ, is intended.

Now to revert to the two opinions as thus defined, the former has the advantage of not militating directly against any article of our creeds; but this arises rather from ambiguity than from correctness; for though probably there is error in both of these statements, the latter appears to be nearer the truth than the former, because the whole difference may be resolved into the order of events; and in this respect I conceive the second view to be correct. The advocates of both opinions expect glorious things in the latter days; they both acknowledge that Jesus Christ will return to this earth some time or other; but the one party are "waiting for the coming of our Lord"—they are, in the first place, "expecting the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour," and a restitution of all things consequent upon that event; whereas the others are expecting that the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord for a thousand years before the day of the Lord; they, therefore, deny the pre-millennial advent of Christ; for one cannot believe two things which are essentially opposed to each other. It would be an abuse of the rational intellect to suppose a man could be in constant expectation of the Lord's advent, and, at the same time, be looking for a thousand years of blessedness to precede that event. A man could not sincerely contemplate the probability of both hypotheses being correct, for one expectation is utterly destructive of the other. We will then assume, as a matter of course, that one who looks for a spiritual millennium is not waiting for the appearing of Jesus Christ.

There are, therefore, two great heads of inquiry: is a spiritual millennium consistent with the character of this present dispensation?—or, on the other hand, is the speedy coming of our Lord a scriptunal expectation?

ROMANISM IN ITALY.

Passing from France to the consideration of the Catholic affairs of Italy, we cannot but be struck with the greatly different appearance of the Roman Church in these two countries. In France, every one agrees that the Catholic Church counts at present more faithful adherents, than 20, 30, or 40 years ago, and that the movement in favor of it is still increasing in strength, notwithstanding some local dissensions; in Italy, not many Romanists will seriously pretend that their Church is still as strong as at the beginning of the present century. It has considerably declined since that time. In France, all the three conservative parties which compromised for the election of Louis Napoleon as president in order to get rid of the republic, and which gave him six millions of votes against one million of republicans, are seeking the alliance of the Church, and the Church appears to stand higher than any one single political power; in Italy, the clergy, with a small portion of the laity, form an insignificant political fraction, which is considered by all the other political parties as the chief obstacle to the political regeneration of the country. Romish writers have always been slow in acknowledging the evidence of historical truth if it was unfavorable to the cause of the church.—Still they begin to feel uneasy about Italy, and speak on the affairs of Italian Catholicism more in an apologetic than eulogistic tone. It is rare to meet now-a-days with a Catholic writer of any note, who persists, like the Bishop of Arras, in France, in a recent circular to his clergy, to praise the people of Rome as the best and happiest of the world. We have, since 1848, followed the development of Roman Catholicism with great attention; we have studied its history carefully, and mostly from Catholic sources, and have come to the firm belief that there is, at present, no other Catholic country in Europe where the Roman Church is so weak and its foundations so undermined as in Italy.

A formidable foe arises to the Roman Church in the progressing organization of a national Italian party. It is, certainly, a singular phenomenon to see popery, which has labored so many centuries for the subjugation of the world to the absolute rule of a few Italians, on the point of being crushed by the rising spirit of this very same nationality. A few years ago, a distinguished priest, statesman, and philosopher, Gioberti, proposed to the pope to accept the leadership in the national movement of the Italians for becoming again one body politic, to expel the Austrians from Italy, and to found an Italian confederacy. The pope declined this bold idea, as some years ago the plan of Lamenennais for an alliance of the Church with democracy had been rejected by Gregory XVI. Since that time the hopes of all patriotic Italians concentrate upon the King of Sardinia, who is excommunicated by the pope, and Mazzini, who does not consider himself a Catholic at all. Now every step which is tending to promote the re-establishment of Italian nationality is regarded by the organs of the Church as an act of hostility. But notwithstanding these views of the highest authorities of the Church are well known among the people, and al

though the governments, except that of Sardinia, are endeavoring to quell all demonstrations of patriotic sentiment and hope, the patriotism of the country manifests itself on every occasion. Thus, but lately, almost all the large cities of the states of the Church petitioned the pope for the removal of the Austrian troops; of course, without success. As among the Italian patriots the question of a political union of Italy stands foremost, the Church will find herself, at a new revolutionary outbreak, in a very isolated position. The clergy, at least, if they remain faithful to their present course of action, will be regarded and treated as enemies of Italy!

A recent fact illustrates in a striking manner the great contrast of the present feelings of Italy on this subject with what they were formerly. A radical paper of Turin proposed lately to open a national subscription, with the view of furnishing a hundred cannons to the fortification of Alessandria, a strong Italian bulwark against Austria.—The proposal was received throughout Italy with the utmost enthusiasm, and the hundred cannons are already secured. One voice dared to protest; it was "L'Armonia," the clerical paper of Turin. Now this Alessandria, whose hundred cannons will be a national testimonial against the present Rome, is the same fortress which was built by the Italian people in honor of Pope Alexander III., when pope and people found themselves united in a combat against the German Emperor, for the supremacy of the Roman Church and the political liberties of the Italian people.

How loose the tie connecting the Italian people with the Church of Rome has become, is clearly shown by the late events in Sardinia. The voice of a large majority of the people speaks in an unmistakable manner. The Chamber of Representatives voted last year, with 95 against 20 votes, the suppression of all convents. Among some twenty political papers of the capital, there are no more than two advocating the claims of the pope and of the Catholic party. Most of the others are resolute adversaries of everything pertaining to the Church of Rome. In the provinces of Sardinia we find the same proportion; and while the number of newspapers and periodicals in general is constantly increasing, the Catholics cannot even, from want of subscribers, maintain the few which are in their service. During the present year Sardinia has fearlessly marched onward for liberty and reform.—The greatest efforts have been secretly made to induce the king to yield to a concordat like that of Austria. Catholic and anti-Catholic papers have several times announced such an event as at hand; but up to this moment the administration of the government is carried on by the same ministers, and in the same spirit, and with the same general applause on the part of the people. In several instances monks and nuns have been deservedly prosecuted and fined, for refusing to obey the laws of the country, or for scattering among their pupils incendiary pamphlets against the government and constitution. A number of town councils have taken their schools out of the hands of ecclesiastical corporations, to which they have formerly been intrusted. The minister of the interior, Ratazzi, has, in a circular of May 9th, enjoining upon all officers of the state to watch closely the movements of the clergy, and to enforce the law rigidly against them, whenever they transgress it. Several new laws against the privileges of the Roman Church are ready to be laid before the next legislature. It is in vain that the bishops have again unanimously protested against the circular of Ratazzi, and that the clergy are holding large assemblies to concert measures for an effective opposition. They find themselves deserted by the people, and the refusal to shrive such of their parishoners as are commissioned to execute the laws against the Church, has proved an efficient means of making converts for Protestantism. On the progress of Sardinia during the six years of its constitutional existence, and of its struggle with Rome, very encouraging statements are found in the letters written by the Hon. W. Kinney, United States Minister at Turin, to the New York Daily Advertiser. Where, in 1850, there were 6,000 schools, with 260,000 children, we now find over 9,000 schools, with 400,000 pupils, and there are besides numerous classical institutions and three great universities, with over 6,000 students. Besides numerous daily journals, of every shade of opinion, there are 50 periodicals, including two literary reviews.

All the other governments of Italy are at present on good terms with the pope. The King of Naples who last year quarrelled with Rome, on account of an "ecclesiastical court," established by the King in Sicily, and clothed by him with the highest jurisdiction in all ecclesiastical matters, has at last come to an amicable agreement. The Grand Duke of Tuscany spent some time in Rome, and the clergy of his state expect with certainty a concordat like that of Austria. The same hope is entertained by the clergy of the smaller states. In Lombardy the bishops are making the best possible use of the Austrian concordat, and so immoderate are their hierarchical pretensions, that in several instances the government has had to check them, while the good understanding between the government and the German and Hungarian bishops remains undisturbed.

We have searched in vain for utterances of religious zeal in the files of our Catholic papers.—We have found some in France, but have been unable to discover anything of the kind worth recording in Italy. We do not find that a single new religious order or association has been founded, that the churches have been more largely attended, or that a greater zeal has been displayed for propagandism. The silence of the grave seems to reign among the Catholics of Italy.

It is surprising that Italy remains in this lethargy while in many other parts of the ecclesiastical dominions of the pope his power seems to be steadily and considerably on the increase. We cannot leave Rome before considering it in its capacity as the head of the Catholic Church. This we shall do in our next article. We shall invite our readers to ascend with us the height of the Vatican, and to cast an investigating look on the relation of the pope to his subjects, in foreign countries, and on his government of the papal world. This will give us a survey of the outward structure of Romanism in its present condition.—*Ch. Advocate.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, November 1, 1851.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Three numbers more complete the present volume. The expense of *printing* has been paid by our subscribers and near $300 over for the Editor's personal compensation; which gives us about *one-half* enough to cover the actual expenses of our family. We thank our friends for this much; and exceedingly wish it were so that the price of the EXAMINER could be reduced to one dollar per year. All must see, however, that this cannot be, unless we could have fifteen hundred paying subscribers. The *terms*, therefore, must remain at $2 per volume, if the *semi*-monthly issue is continued, and we intend to issue no less frequently than that.

To encourage early payments—which are much to our advantage—we make the following offers, to such as forward us the cash before December 25th, where papers are sent to *one address*, in the *States*.

For *two* copies $3; for *five* copies $7; for *ten* copies $10.

If either of these offers are accepted, let it be distinctly understood, we send the whole number in one envelope, to one individual; and we do not need the names of any other person.

To single subscribers, who pay $2 before Dec. 25th, we will give *two* copies of either of the following works—the subscriber to pay the postage on them—*viz:* "MAN'S DESTINY;" "DOBNEY ABRIDGED;" "THE DISCUSSION," with Prof. Mattison; or, we will give one copy of "BIBLE vs. TRADITION," in paper cover, and pay the postage on it ourself. If any prefer, *instead* of either the foregoing offers, a copy of the "*Revised and Enlarged* SIX SERMONS" we will give them that; but they must pay the postage on it.

Money sent for the BIBLE EXAMINER is at *our risk*, provided the letter is sealed with a wafer and directed as follows—

GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New York.*

☞ Take care to put no other words or figures in the direction, as it will be at *your risk* if you do.

THE RESURRECTION: ANASTASIS.

We have often had occasion to refer to Dr. BLOOMFIELD'S critical notes on the Greek New Testament, edited by Prof. STUART. Recently in looking at his remarks on the question of the Sadducees, and our Lord's reply, relating to the resurrection, we observed some important statements, or admissions. On Matt. 22: 23 he says—

There is little doubt but that the phrase *anastasis tōn nekrōn*, or *anastasis*, denoted, in common parlance, and agreeably to the general doctrines of the Pharisees, the resurrection of the *soul* as well as of the body, and the re-union of both in a future state. Though, at the same time, the ideas of the Pharisees *themselves* (and still more the people at large) as to the nature of that future life, were very vague, and occasionally founded on the notions of the heathens. So that our Lord's reply was, in wisdom, so framed as not only to refute the *Sadduceean* doctrines, but remove the misconceptions of the Pharisees; and thus to benefit not only the *unbelievers* of the doctrine of the resurrection, but the *misbelievers*."

On the foregoing statement, of Dr. Bloomfield, we remark, *first*—The resurrection of the dead—*anistasis tōn reckōn*—"denoted, in common parlance," or discourse, even with the "Pharisees," not a resurrection of "the body," merely, but "of the *soul*." In other words, it embraced whatever constituted *the man—the entire manhood*. Let this fact be remembered; and it follows, that when Christ and his apostles speak of the resurrection of *the dead*, "in common parlance," the *soul* is included, whatever that soul is. No matter what the Pharisees meant by the immortality of the soul, so long as they maintained it must have a resurrection in order to a future life; they clearly had no idea of a future life to disembodied human souls.

Second: The Pharisees, it seems, held to a "re-union" of souls and bodies in a future state; hence it was, that they taught the *transmigration* of souls; *i. e.*, the passing of their fancied immortal souls into other bodies at death; without which, those souls would have no resurrection, and could not live in their estimation. Their notions "as to the *nature* of that life were very vague, and occasionally founded on the notions of the heathens," says Dr. Bloomfield. It is evident from all this, that the Pharisees were ignorant of the true *nature* of the resurrection, though in *words* they held to a resurrection. This Dr. Bloomfield admits by saying, "Our Lord's reply [to the Sadducees] was so framed as" ***" to remove the *misconceptions* of the Pharisees," who were "the *misbelievers*." They professedly believed in "the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust;" but their views were false and erroneous in several particulars. First,—The resurrection they advocated was a necessary result of the supposed immortality of the soul, which leaving its present tenement behind at death, must have another body to enter in order to its continued life; such was their resurrection of body and soul, and "re-union in another life."

Another error of the Pharisee's doctrine of resurrection was, that it embraced "both the just and

the *unjust*." This er
see; but he says—"
wisdom, so framed as
duceean doctrines, bu
tions of the *Pharisees*;
the *unbelievers* of the
but the *misbelievers*;'
believe aright on th
denied that there is to
dead," either of the go
by showing that there
good, and at the same
notion of the resurrecti
teaches, distinctly, that
the angels of God in hea
of the wicked dead, if
gives "Abraham, Isaa
of those "which shall b
that world" [the futu
tion from the dead;"

With the two-edged
in pieces the Pharisees
gration of souls and
ed dead, while he dem
the resurrection of the
did he "refute the *Sad*
move the misconceptio
rect their *misbelief*. Bu
and did not profit by hi
"own traditions"—lik
they still adhered to th
Paul's testimony, Acts
his Jewish accusers "
rection of the dead, bo
while they found fault
the resurrection of Je
asleep in him."

It is often asserted t
be a resurrection bot
Paul never said any su
of the resurrection was
"hope;" not of fear o
of any other resurrecti
for, but that of such as
For preaching this, he
saic Jews; yet they the
be a more extensive re
tended for; even of "b
for such an extensive re
one word in all his pre
the other hand, he proc
the dead as an object o
most dilligently, and to
in Christ; hence he sa

the *unjust.*" This error Dr. Bloomfield did not see; but he says—"Our Lord's reply, was, in wisdom, so framed as not only to refute the *Sadduceean* doctrines, but to remove the misconceptions of the *Pharisees;* and thus to benefit not only the *unbelievers* of the doctrine of the resurrection, but the *misbelievers;*" that is, those who did not believe aright on the subject. The Sadducees denied that there is to be "*any* resurrection of the dead," either of the good or bad. Jesus refutes them by showing that there is to be a resurrection of the *good*, and at the same time refutes the Pharisaic notion of the resurrection of the wicked dead; for, he teaches, distinctly, that the resurrected ones "are as the angels of God in heaven;" which could not be said of the wicked dead, if revived into life. And Jesus gives "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," as the *samples* of those "which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world" [the future life] "even the resurrection from the dead;" Luke 20.

With the two-edged sword of truth our Lord hews in pieces the Pharisees, false notion of the transmigration of souls and the resurrection of the wicked dead, while he demonstrates to the Sadducees the resurrection of the righteous dead. Thus, truly, did he "refute the *Sadduceean* doctrines," and "remove the misconceptions of the *Pharisees*," and correct their *misbelief.* But they were "fools and blind," and did not profit by his teaching. Bound up in their "own traditions"—like thousands in these days—they still adhered to their errors, as we learn from Paul's testimony, Acts 24: 15, where he states that his Jewish accusers "allow there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust," while they found fault with him for maintaining the resurrection of Jesus and of those who "*fall asleep in him.*"

It is often asserted that, "Paul said, there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust." Paul never said any such thing. Paul's doctrine of the resurrection was one which was an object of "hope;" not of fear or dread. He never speaks of any other resurrection of the dead, to be looked for, but that of such as fall "asleep *in* Christ."—For preaching this, he was accused of the Pharisaic Jews; yet they themselves allowed there would be a more extensive resurrection than Paul contended for; even of "both the just and unjust;" for such an extensive resurrection Paul never said one word in all his preaching or Epistles; but, on the other hand, he proclaimed the resurrection from the dead as an object of "hope," to be sought for most dilligently, and to be bestowed only on those *in* Christ; hence he saith, he labored and suffered "If by *any means* I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. 3: 11.

HARD TO PLEASE.

Our readers will recollect that we copied into the EXAMINER, last March, the entire article of Rev. S. COMFORT, on the "*Immortality of the Wicked,*" from the *Northern Christian Advocate.* After waiting more than six months, Mr. Comfort comes out with two long articles, in said paper, in what he calls a "Review" of our remarks on his previous article. He begins with a complaint that we broke up his article into *parts*, and followed those broken parts with our remarks. He says, we had "a perfect right" to copy his article into the EXAMINER, but he thinks we ought to have given it to our "readers unbroken," &c. If Mr. Comfort had sent his article to the EXAMINER he would have a claim for its insertion in the manner he contends for, and it would have been so inserted; but in reviewing articles from other papers no editor ever does what C. thinks we ought to have done; nor will he find a paper among all those published by his denomination (Episcopal Methodist) that would transfer an entire article of ours to its columns in any form. Some of them have taken mangled extracts, just enough to misrepresent us, but would not suffer our arguments against their views to appear even "broken up" into paragraphs. *We* gave Mr. Comfort's entire argument, every word of it; which is more than any other Reviewer does for his opponent, when copied from the paper where it originally appeared. It is not usual in a review to give anything more than the *points* of the article reviewed. But we can afford to be generous to our opposers, hence we gave all that Mr. C. wrote, and so distinguished from our remarks that any person, wishing to do so, could read his article without noticing our review at all, if that pleased them best; or they could read all he said on one point and then our remarks, as they passed on. If such an arrangement did not satisfy all, we must think them "hard to please." Of this class, it seems, Mr. C. is one; if, indeed, he does not constitute the *whole* class; for we doubt if any other man can be found who will like to be placed in that class. We regard this complaint as a simple acknowledgment that he has no substantial ground of complaint, and so endeavors to cover his baldness with some kind of gauze to escape the scorchings of truth which he found pouring on his defenceless head. That his article and arguments were broken up into fragments may be true, and doubtless is; but that he has any ground

to complain of unfairness or want of courtesy in "the manner in which it was done," we do not believe any man besides himself will affirm. Let him show us a solitary example in all his Church where we can be treated with the fullness and fairness we showed him. Can he do it? He knows he cannot: and his complaint of us comes with evidence on its face that he felt a mortification at the demolition of his famed arguments for the "*Immortality of the Wicked.*"

We shall take very little notice of Mr. C.'s last articles further than to show the reader what seems to be the absolute dishonesty he has practiced in quoting our language. We will be glad to find he did not *intend* dishonesty. We said, EXAMINER page 85,

"The *literal* destruction of the wicked is neither opposed 'to common sense' nor 'an impossibility.' But it is opposed 'to common sense,' and 'an impossibility,' that an 'immaterial, immortal, and indestructible' being can *suffer* in any way or by any means, 'hence' such beings need not fear the *theological* hell," &c.

How does Mr. Comfort quote this language?—Does he do it truly, or honestly? Read his perversion as follows:—

"The *literal* destruction of the wicked is neither opposed" "to common sense" nor "an impossibility." "But it is opposed" [to both, that such a] "being can *suffer* in any way, or by any means;" &c.

Thus, it will be seen, Mr. C. has made us to say, to the readers of the *Northern Christian Advocate*, that, "the wicked" *cannot* "*suffer* in any way," &c. We said, that an "*immaterial, immortal*, and *indestructible* being" cannot suffer. Our description of the being that cannot suffer he has boldly excluded from his extract, thus bearing "false witness against" us; for we never said "*the wicked*" cannot suffer. Why this perversion of *our* words? Let him not talk of "a moral obtuseness" as having "come over" our "spiritual aspirations," while he can thus misrepresent us and our words. We treated Mr. Comfort fairly and gave *all* his words; but he neither gives all ours, nor quotes us truly in his extracts. We had thought him an honorable man, and trusted he was a christian; but we are sorry to say, that our confidence in either his honor or christianity is amazingly shaken; still we hope he may recover himself from falling into the same condemnation of a certain PROFESSOR, who has preceeded him in misrepresentation.

Our statement of the impossibility of an "immaterial, immortal, and indestructible" being suffering, Mr. C. saw fit to hide by a substitution of his own words in brackets, which it seems he could not be ignorant was not a truthful representation of us, unless he is of that class of men our Saviour speaks of Matt 23: 17, first part of the verse. As to the "*theological* hell," of which we spoke, it is evident Mr. C, considered it annihilated. That hell is thus described by "orthodoxy:"—"A dark and bottomless pit, full of fire and brimstone" *** "where the wicked must drink in everlasting torture," &c, Mr. C. seems to be convinced, that the *bodies* of the wicked cannot be hurt there, if "immortal and indestructible;" so he resolves hell into the "*moral* elements;" a very different matter from the "*theological* hell." Yet Mr. C. and his school will find themselves in as great difficulty to make out "*moral*" suffering, to hardened sinners, as in making out physical sufferings. Some sinners are "past feeling," Paul saith, while here. No *moral* considerations can affect them when the hardening process is completed; so that Mr. C.'s new fangled hell is as likely to be powerless, for harm, as the old "*theological*" one. But there is a Bible hell which "devours," *consumes*, "*annihilates*" the wicked; and in particular, "*all liars* shall have their part" therein. If men deceive themselves with the idea that falsehood and deception, when uttered or practised for their creeds, is *piety*, let them know "God is not mocked," the doom of all such is fixed by "the Judge of all the earth."

Mr. Comfort's articles throughout, so far as he professes to give a representation of our views, are a tissue of misrepresentation. Had he given our entire words, as we did his, the readers of the *Advocate* could have judged for themselves as to his fairness in reply. As he has presented mangled and altered parts of our words he has set a ball in motion which will be rolled on—by Preachers who read his articles and have not seen ours from which he professes to quote—and will be likely to involve many in false statements, for which he is specially responsible, as he had the means in his own hands of preventing the circulation of such falsehoods.

So far as Mr. C. has brought forward scripture in proof of his positions, relative to the soul, he has presented nothing new, and therefore it needs no notice from us, as we have often shown the utter unavailableness of the texts produced to prove that man has a distinct entity called the soul, or that the soul, whatever it is, is immortal.

Failing to find anything in the received canon of scripture in support of the immortality, of "the soul," Mr. C. resorts to the *Apocrypha!* How does he succeed with his *apocryphal-soul?* He calls, like some of old, "O, Baal save us?" "Will not the Apochrypha help us?" Well, we

shall see—Mr. C. said in his Essay, which we reviewed, "God made the soul in the image of his own eternity." Of this assertion we said in reply, it "may pass, as the falsehood of it is too apparent to need or merit a reply." This remark, it seems, stung Mr. C., and he says "If he" [Mr. Storrs]" will turn to the 'Wisdom of Solomon,' 2: 23, he will find this passage which suggested the terms of the 'falsehood,' but not the sentiment: 'For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity.'"

This is an acknowledgment of Mr. C. that he can find nothing in the canonical scriptures even to "*suggest* the terms" he employed in speaking of *the soul;* and a further acknowledgment, that he does not find "the *sentiment*" of "the terms" he employed in even the Apocrypha! Why then, in the name of truth, does he go there to bolster up the "falsehood" which we said was "too apparent to need or merit a reply?" What has he gained by this call upon the Apocrypha to convert the "falsehood" into truth? The text he quotes only condemns him the more. What did Mr. C. say? He said—"God made *the soul*"—that is, an "immaterial" entity—"in the image of his own eternity." Such was the "falsehood." What does the apocryphal text say? It saith—"God created *man* to be immortal, and made *him* to be an image of his own eternity."

In this text not one word is said about "*the soul;*" and Mr. C. must have been deeply steeped in "immaterialism" to find the theological soul in it, or anything to "suggest the terms" he employed. "*Man*"—not "the soul"—was what "God created *to be* immortal;" not, He created man immortal; but "*to be*" so, conditioned on his not committing sin; for adds the "Wisdom of Solomon," next verse, "Nevertheless, through the envy of the devil *came death* into the world; and THEM THAT DO HOLD OF HIS SIDE DO FIND IT."—Then they do not find immortality, nor get "the image of God's own eternity." Thus Mr. Comfort finds as little help in the apocryphal books as in the canonical scriptures; and his only hope to sustain the "*falsehood*" is to go at once, and direct, to the old heathens; but, alas, for the falsehood, even there he must wander in thick darkness, for, saith Bishop WHATELY, "The ancient heathens did but *conjecture* without proof, respecting a future state."

That God created *man* to be immortal, and to be an image of His own eternity to come, if man would develop holiness, or harmony with his CREATOR, we never doubted; but that He created *man in such a state* is a "falsehood" to which we would no more assent than to the first great *lie* that was ever uttered, viz:—"Ye shall not surely die."—One statement is just as true as the other; and it is no time to "wink at" such falsehoods any longer. In the "times of ignorance," when the Church was wrapt up in Papal superstitions, or just emerging from them, men might deal in such falsehoods without sin, for ought we know; but that darkness is past, unless men willingly or wilfully remain with the cloud on their minds; and they will find God will hold them responsible if they "receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only." "How can" such "believe" the truth, when that truth blasts their proud theories and lays in the dust "the loftiness of man!" Mr. C. thinks Mr. STORRS lowers "the dignity of man!" The "serpent" thought man's "dignity" was too low, and gave him information how he might rise higher, and "*be as Gods;*" and ever since that advice was taken, proud man has striven to make it out that "God made the soul in the image of His own eternity;" thus adding sin to sin, and pride to pride.

A JUST REBUKE.

The following article appeared in the *Christian Intelligencer*, Aug 14th. It is a just rebuke of the preacher, and shows the manner in which some of the advocates of natural immortality impose on the public, and prop up the spirit rapping delusion.—This spirit manifestation pretention all grows out of, and is based upon such teaching as that spoken of in the following remarks.

SPIRITUALISM AMONG THE BAPTISTS.

On last Lord's Day evening a full house was attracted by the following notice:

☞ Rev. J. Wescott, of Gloversville, N. Y., (formerly of the Laight street Baptist Church, of this city,) will preach next LORD'S DAY, Aug. 10, at the Berean Baptist Church, (Rev. Dr. Dowling's) corner of Bedford and Downing streets: Subjects—At 10 1-2 A. M., on *The nature of Angels, and their intercourse with men.* In the EVENING at 7 1-2, on the question, *Do the spirits of the departed know what is occurring on earth, and have they the power to influence the mind of the living.*

The writer attended, expecting to hear discussed and exploded this part of the spiritualistic theory, but was very much surprised to hear the speaker maintain the *affirmative* of both propositions. His text was Heb. xii. 1: "We also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses." In favor of the first proposition, he produced the text.—Witnesses of the fact of our Christian race, must be still looking on, *therefore*, those mentioned in the previous chapter, and by consequence all other departed spirits must know what is going on in the earth. Rev. vi. 10, was quoted for the same

purpose, "And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell upon the earth!" The inference was, that departed spirits must know what is occurring on earth, otherwise those referred to in the last quotation would not know but that they were already avenged! The scene of the Transfiguration was adduced to prove the same thing.

The second proposition was stilted upon Rev. xxii. 9. When John was about to worship the *angel*, he forbade him, saying, "I am thy fellow servant, and *of thy brethren the prophets*." The inference was, that the spirit of an old prophet "had the power to influence the mind of the living," and by consequence, the spirits of our departed friends have this power to influence us. But if this be true, then there is no escape from the assumption of the spiritualist, that angels and the souls of men are of *the same nature*. The preacher evidently is not acquainted with the original of a wrongly translated passage, or he never would have ventured upon such a statement. The true rendering is this, "I am a fellow servant with thee, and *with thy brethren the prophets*," of whom John was one.

In maintaining his last proposition, the preacher said that the influence of our departed friends must be looked for in more respectable manifestations than those we now commonly hear of; from which I inferred he was not committed out and out to the cause of spiritualism; but the above principles of spiritualists being granted, we do not see how the preacher can expect that his auditors should not, from his discourse, which as will be seen must have been addressed to the feelings, look very favorably upon our modern *necromancy*. We regard it as beyond the wit of man logically to establish either of these propositions from the Bible. Especially is the last one utterly without foundation. "Claptrap" is always below the dignity of the pulpit; but when we find it virtually throwing the cause of Christ into the hand of the enemy for the paltry sake of securing a big audience, it ought to be severely rebuked. Spiritualism has much to hope for from such preaching as this, and we should not wonder, if many of those draped in black, who heard this talk, would soon be found among our spiritualistic circles, consulting their departed friends.

W. R. G.

THE PAPAL CONTEST IN FRANCE.—The contest between the *Univers* and the *Correspondent*, alluded to by us lately, has already assumed to itself gigantic dimensions, according to our latest advices from Europe. A war of no ordinary significance is being waged in Paris, and throughout the province of France, with pens sharp as steel, and steeped in religious prejudice and jealousy; on the one side is the *Univers*, the monarch of its species, with Veuillot, its distinguished editor; on the other side stands the equally celebrated name of Montalembert, assisted by De Falloux and De Broglie.—With such antagonism as this, it is no marvel that the English papal papers should remark that "it is a division occupying the attention of all Roman Catholics, which is evoking from day to day, and from month to month, literary efforts of surpassing interest, and involving consequences of incalculable moment."

The charge brought against the *Univers* is thus summed up by a Roman Catholic journal: "The *Univers* is accused of a servile adhesion to the Emperor Napoleon III.; of advocating arbitary power and absolutism on principle; of indentifying the Church, and the teachings of the church, with civil despotism and religious persecution; of repelling the sympathies of all who were favorably disposed to religion; and of playing into the hands of infidels and atheists, by admitting as true, and defending as right, calumnious charges and imputed crimes, as to which Catholic apologists have always adopted the line of either denying the facts, or disproving the complicity of the Church."

Popery, in France, is in a very ambiguous and perplexing relation to the state. All its traditional and orthodox ties bind it to the displaced Bourbons, while its temporizing policy allies it to Napoleon; of course the latter cannot fully trust it, and the priests cannot fully sympathize with him. This fact is the key to the above internal disturbances.—*Ch. Advocate.*

MAN'S INHERITANCE.

BY THE EDITOR.

"Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." Matt 5: 5.

We shall endeavor to show that *the earth*, and *not heaven*, is the inheritance God has designed for man; conditioned, however, on a moral development in harmony with God. We argue this—

FROM THE ACCOUNT OF MAN'S CREATION, AND VARIOUS PROPHECIES.

"And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and *let them have dominion* over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and *over all the earth*, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them; and God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and *have dominion* over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every LIVING THING that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 1: 26–28.

Here we see that man was made—

1. *To have* DOMINION over the earth and all things thereon. The Psalmist saith, "*The heaven*, even the heavens, are the LORD'S, but *the earth* hath he given to the children of men." Psa. 115 : 16.

2. Man was to "*replenish the earth*;" *i. e.*, to fill it with inhabitants; *not* to provide inhabitants for heaven. This intimation of man's destination is not to be mistaken nor overlooked. Here is no hint that man was designed for any other sphere than that of earth. If he had been, it is remarkable that no hint is anywhere given of it in the account of his creation, or in that of his trial for the development of a moral character. If his destination had been that of a sphere removed from the earth, we have a right to look for a special announcement of it somewhere in these accounts. As none such is made, we conclude the earth was designed as his inheritance.

We further argue that such was his destination from the fact—

3. That man was directed to *cultivate* the earth —"*subdue it*:"—*not to gain heaven*, or a higher sphere. This earth seems to have been designed as his *home*; and he was directed to carry forward the work his CREATOR had laid out for him to a higher perfection; thereby developing his own powers of body and mind, thus continually accumulating happiness and honoring his MAKER who had given him his powers and the earth with its fullness on which to exercise them. The CREATOR did not carry His own work to its highest perfection, but only so far as to furnish the new made being—man—with everything needful for perfecting himself and multiplying his own happiness without limits, except as all was to be conducted in harmony with the will of the CREATOR.

Thus was an ample field opened for man's cultivation, improvement, and continually advancing enjoyment. No wonder it is said, when the CREATOR had thus produced man and spread out his work for him, "And God saw every thing He had made, and behold, it was VERY GOOD." Gen. 1 : 31.

The Psalmist confirms the view of man's DOMINION, we have taken, Psa. 8th. "Thou hast made him" [man] "a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou *madest him to have* DOMINION over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet; all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea." And he adds—"O LORD our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!"

Thus we see, the first place assigned to man was, to have universal DOMINION over this earth and its contents. This dominion man lost, or surrendered up his authority, by compliance with another's wish, instead of cleaving to his MAKER'S will as supreme. Who, or what that tempter was, by which man lost his dominion, we will not now stop to inquire. It is sufficient for our present purpose to know, that man did make the surrender to some power; and that the surrender brought sorrow, pain, and death; whereby it is evident his dominion is gone; for while it remained, in the perfection with which his CREATOR bestowed it, sorrow, pain and death could not be supposed to enter on man's domain; because his dominion was unlimited "over all the earth" and "every living thing." In such universal authority and power, what would harm man while he retained it? But in an unguarded hour he surrendered his dominion, and henceforth is liable to all the evils arising from subjection to the power of evil. This power of evil, or evil power—whatever it is—henceforth holds the dominion man surrendered; and it is, in the nature of the case, a power hostile to God and His government: it was only by man's disobedience to God that this evil power now reigns. This power, then, is a *usurper* in one sense, and in another it reigns by right. It is a usurper in relation to God, and it reigns by right in relation to man. God gave man the dominion to exercise in his own proper personality; but He did not give man the right to transfer that dominion to another power; it was to be held in subjection to God, and used only according to His specified arrangement. But man, contrary to his MAKER'S expressed will, did give his independence or dominion to another power, and thus became subject to that power and to its dominion. Thus the earth came under the government and curse of the evil power.

The question now arises—Will God suffer this usurper to retain his authority forever? We think not. God's wisdom, honor, and power,—to say nothing of His other perfections—are all involved in the matter.

How then is the evil to be remedied? or the usurper's power to be overthrown? Is it by removing the posterity of Adam, who return to their allegiance to God, to another orb, sphere, or to heaven, and at last destroying the territory, or earth, over which the usurper held sway? This would not be a conquest, and would not seem to honor the CREATOR'S wisdom or power. It seems most in accordance with the wisdom and power of God that there should be a conquest of the usurping power on the territory where the usurpation was

committed, and a recovery of the territory itself, and of the lost dominion. But as these were lost by a voluntary giving up, by man, to the evil power, that power must be overcome by *man*, if rightfully dispossessed.

That a usurper, called the devil and satan, has dominion over the earth is clear from the fact that the "very good," stamped on creation, is marred, most awfully so: "an enemy hath done this."—Besides, *diabolos* claimed the dominion of earth, and said, "all the kingdoms of the world" are "delivered to me:" Luke 4: 5–6. "Liar" though he is, yet, on this occasion, Jesus, the second Adam, did not contradict his claim. It had been "delivered to" him by the first Adam, as we have seen; and yet it was a usurpation so far as God's claim was concerned; but as God had given man the dominion and man had transferred it to *diabolos*, the latter if dispossessed must be treated fairly. He had given no equivalent to man, it is true: yet he did not seize it by violence. If recovered, therefore, it must be done neither by falsehood nor violence; it must be regained by a fair and open contest of manhood against this evil power.

The second Adam comes to the rescue. In fair and open conflict, in manhood, he met the power of evil, or *diabolos*, and most triumphantly "overcame;" thus establishing his right to the earth, and to re-establish man in the dominion, in his own time; which is "the time appointed of the Father," and yet future. The second Adam is the Restorer, and the rightful heir. See the following texts:—

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by HIS SON, WHOM HE HATH APPOINTED HEIR OF ALL THINGS."—"For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world" [*oikoumeneen*, the habitable earth] "to come, whereof we speak." Heb. 1: 1, 2 and 2: 5. Compare this with the following—"Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done ON EARTH as it is heaven." "And the kingdom and DOMINION, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High." "And in the days of these kings" [the iron and clay divisions of the "fourth," or Roman kingdom,] "the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed"*** "it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."—Matt. 6: 10. Dan. 7: 27, and 2: 44. See also Dan. 7: 13, 14—"One like the Son of man,"*** "and there was given him DOMINION, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him."

Thus we see who is to have the *dominion*, and that it is to be "under the whole heaven" and "on earth"—"the habitable earth." Does all this look as if God had determined to remove his people off the territory, originally given to men, to some other distant and unknown sphere, or place? In connection with the foregoing texts, look at the following: "The righteous shall never be removed: but the wicked shall *not inhabit the earth*." "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth*; much more the wicked and the sinner." Prov. 10: 30, and 11: 31.

Here we see that the recompense of both classes of men is to be on the earth. The righteous are never to be removed from it, but the wicked shall not inhabit it. What then is to take place? Let Solomon answer—"The upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall REMAIN in it: but the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Prov. 2: 21, 22.

The scriptures represent the wicked as being REMOVED, or rather *destroyed*; but the righteous are "to remain." The wicked are to be gathered out of his kingdom, (see Matt. 13: 41, 42,) not the righteous taken out of the territory, or off the earth. So far from the righteous being removed, we are expressly told, there is to be a "*restitution;*" and at that time, instead of the saints being taken up to heaven, Christ the Lord is to come "*from* heaven," or return to the earth. Let the following texts be read and compared together:—"And He shall send Jesus Christ," *** "whom the heavens must receive until the times of *restitution* of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the world began."—Acts 3: 20, 21. "And when he (Jesus) had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight.—And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? THIS SAME JESUS, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come *in like manner* as ye have seen him go into heaven:" Acts 1: 9–11. "And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east" *** "and the LORD my God shall come, and all the saints with thee,"*** "and the LORD shall be king over all the earth, in that day shall there be one LORD, and his name one:" Zech. 14: 4, 5. 9.—

"Behold the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice IN THE earth:" Jer. 23: 5. "Say among the heathen, the LORD reigneth; *the world* also shall be establishsd that it shall NOT BE MOVED: he shall judge the people righteously;" *** "he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth;" Psa. 96: 10, 13. "He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and the poor with judgment," [equity.]*** "In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth; he shall have DOMINION also from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of *the earth*:" Psa. 72. See the whole Psalm.

Some men seem to think the earth shall never be rescued from the usurper's power, but that those reconciled to God must be removed and the earth destroyed. Let such not forget that JEHOVAH hath declared—"Truly as I live, *all the earth* shall be filled with the glory of the LORD:" Numb. 14: 21. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the LORD: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee," &c: Psa. 22: 22–31. "For *the earth* shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea." Isa. 11: 9.

We have given a sample, only, of what things "God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets," and which are embraced in the "*restitution*," when "God shall send Jesus" as the RESTORER.

We shall see in "the restitution" that God made this "world to be inhabited," (Isa. 45: 18,) not to be destroyed. He will claim it from under the dominion of the usurping power; and with the "Son of God," who is the "*Son of man*," in possession of the dominion, which Adam lost, the earth will be renewed, "subdued," and become the Garden of God, or as the Garden of Eden.

Thus restored, renewed, and governed; the power of evil destroyed—sin, sorrow, pain and death annihilated—if the earth is not an inheritance that will fully meet the wants and aspirations of those in harmony with God, heaven itself cannot be supposed to afford the means of their gratification. Indeed, such dissatisfied ones must be of the number not possessed of the *meekness* to whom the "earth inheritance" is promised.

The day of triumph is to be ushered in by exulting "voices in heaven," mighty and "great, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our LORD, and of his CHRIST; and he shall reign for ever and ever." Rev. 11: 15.

Such is to be the consummation of the present conflict with the power of evil, or evil power.—The Christ—the *anointed* of God—the second Adam—is to regain the lost dominion, and to retain it forevermore: and to all the race of Adam who "overcome" the evil power, in their own proper personality, the anointed Restorer hath said—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in *my* throne, even as I overcame, and am sit down with my Father in his throne." Rev. 3: 21. Thus, earth delivered—the dominion restored—Christ on his throne, "the throne of his father David," (Lk. 2: 22,) which God has "sworn with an oath" to give unto him, (Acts 2: 30)—the usurper overthrown—the earth reclaimed, and all its arrangements in harmony with the mind of God—war ceased—love everywhere triumphant—peace universal—Paradise revived and enlarged, filling the whole earth, man's *inheritance* will be perfect, complete, and joyous beyond all present human conception. Glory be to God and the Lamb for such a prospect, and such an inheritance. May we be among "the meek" who "shall inherit the earth."

From Mrs. A. C. Judson, Victor, N. Y.

Br. Storrs.—I send you a scrap of poetry which was laid away some time since in the corner of my portfolio, as suggestive of some ideas relative to the *great truth* we so ardently love—*Life only through Christ our Redeemer.*

"I Hear the Passing Bell."

BY PARK BENJAMIN.

I hear the passing bell!
Another soul, it says, has gone from earth,
Another soul has had immortal birth.

This deep and solemn knell
Is dirge and requiem to a dear one dead,
For whom tears, bitter tears are vainly shed.

No more—it speaks—no more
Shall be seen among you; through the gloom
Of these last rites he passes to the tomb.

Upon the silent shore
Of an eternal land, beyond the sea
Of life, his home must henceforth ever be.

He is familiar now
With the grand Mystery,—and he surveys
Truth in the brightness of its perfect blaze.

Then pile upon his brow
The valley clods, and leave his ruined form
Where the wind wails and beats the wintry storm.

To him will come no harm,
For his immortal part survives and dwells
Beyond the grave's gloom and the toll of bells.

His is the deathless charm;
No pains can ring, no griefs his peace molest.
His the assurance of perrenial rest.

Then strike the passing bell,
As to the tomb, with slowly-measured tread,
Ye reverently bear his honored head.

And say, with thee 'tis well
Forevermore our brother! though we pay
With broken hearts these last rites to thy clay.

This is written, as you will perceive, by one of our most gifted sons of song; and is correct in rhythm, lofty in sentiment, and truly charming in its arrangement. But only a portion of it can we see is *truthful*, which of course greatly lessens our admiration of it. Now I cannot but think that *truth* and *poetry* ought to be united, although the received opinion seems to be that they are opposites. We certainly have an example of the most genuine poetry in the Bible which is truth itself; and where can be found themes so expansive and exalted, and so well worthy the employment of the most highly gifted poetic genius as upon the pages of inspiration? They are almost innumerable—those lofty themes, and the Christian poet need never be under the necessity of having recourse to pagan mythologies or papal absurdities for themes upon which to employ his God-given powers.

Yet, how much of our best written poetry is all wrong: and much of it has been written undoubtedly under the impression that it was Bible truth, while it was only the traditions of men.—The author of these beautiful lines was versifying a theological opinion, which he might have supposed was based upon scripture. It is appropriate, indeed for the spirit-rappers, and all in their wake,—but for us who are looking for the crown of life "when Christ who is our Life and shall appear," such poetry will not answer.

In my own manuscripts of by-gone years, I find many a poem that sings of the saint wafted away to paradise, while "the house *he lived in*," was laid beneath the clods, and I surely supposed at the time that my ideas were in accordance with truth. Yet, I often pondered over the mystery of being *alive and dead at the same time*, but thought it *must be believed* if not in accordance with reason or the dictates of common sense. At times, sceptical thoughts (as I called them) would harass and perplex me. There flashes up in my mind just now one beautifully bright Autumnal afternoon. I stood by the coffin of a lovely child, who was lovely even then with its rigid form, and marble brow, and arrayed for its cheerless tenement. I gazed and gazed until lost in contemplation, and my thoughts were these—"How still! how senseless! no breath, no motion, no life—and where is that which animated the little form and gave action to the intellect? Was there an etherial something, that has taken wings and gone to be with the angels? And is this merely the tenement of a spiritual and immortal part that is something—we know not what—and has gone somewhere—we know not where? Why is it not more rational to think that this is the *real being itself*—the dear little child who has lain down in its dreamless sleep, to awaken again by and by more bright and beautiful than ever?" But I started from my musings with the thought that this was *infidelity*, and must be banished at once—was even shocked for having admitted such thoughts for a moment.

My heart is filled with thanksgiving that my eyes have been opened to see the truth upon this subject—That *God alone hath immortality*—and *that those who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honor and immortality, shall have eternal life*—not at death, but in the glorious morning of the resurrection. O! of what value now appears the Resurrection! Dark indeed would our world be without it.

And now, as I have bid adieu to such poetic imagery, as that of the saint at death *robed in snowy whiteness*, and *having angelic wings soaring away above the stars* and singing praises to God—is there nothing left for verse when a friend has departed? O yes. There is the peaceful sleep in Jesus—the "life hid with Christ in God"—the glorious resurrection—and the mortal *then* putting on immortality. These, and many more, themes, inexhaustible and noble, worthy a more exalted intellect and pen than those which have fallen to my own humble lot. But, I commenced with the intention of saying a few words only, and have protracted my thoughts to a full letter.

Yours in hope, A. C. JUDSON.

From Rufus Wendell.

Canajoharie, N. Y., Oct. 22, 1856.

DEAR BRO. STORRS:— Having used the *nom de plume* of "MACKNIGHT, JR." as long as my sense of duty will permit me to do so, allow me in the next EXAMINER to inform its readers that the articles over that signature, in the current volume, are from my pen. Relative to the import of our Lord's words to the Sadducees, (Luke 20th) I do not see that farther discussion between Bro. Grew and myself would be profitable—at least for the present. Bro. G.'s "Reply No. 4" in this month's issue contains no *new* idea on the discourse in question, and as it is *his* right to be heard last in the argument, I leave the matter where it stands—commending to our readers' serious and candid consideration *all* that has been presented on *both sides*. The "misapprehension" which my brother thought it "necessary to correct" in his last reply, has at no time existed in my mind. If Bro. G. will read my last response with a little more care, he will readily perceive that it is *one* thing to say that he "has lost confidence in Luke 20: 37, 38 as proving the reliving of the wicked dead," and *another* and *different* thing to intimate that those passages constitute the "*main point* of (his) confidence" in such revival: the former I have done—the latter I have not. In my last response I wrote this sentence—"This I am confident the unprejudiced reader will see, whether Bro. G. does or not." By these words no disrespect to my beloved brother was intended, but as his reference to them in his last reply leads me to consider them improper, I withdraw them. I would not willingly offend against the divine precept, "*Be courteous.*" In this connection I should perhaps add that I am unshaked in the conviction that the words of Christ to the Sadducees are "*positive* testimony that the wicked dead will" *not live* again."

Bro. Grew's remarks upon 2 Tim. 1: 10, besides misrepresenting *my* position, are, as I judge, very unfortunate for his cause: but of this more at another time.

RUFUS WENDELL.

BIBL

NO IMMORTALITY,

VOL. XI.

PUBLISHED S

TERMS—Two D

Always in

GEO. STORRS, EDITO

THE CHURCH'S

BY GEORGE DUKE

In a former chapter I be certain characteristic tion; I proceed now to p should be the longing a with regard to the future

"The grace of God w teacheth us, "that denyi ly lusts, we should live godly in this present wo nied worldly lusts, and eously, but, yet was not the duties of the second duties of the first—we s that such a man was no of God which bringeth sa der the teaching of the S liness and righteousness. grace of God, which bring No; it also teaches us to glorious appearance of ou Jesus Christ," and, appa that this expectation is as sally taught, as is the d worldly lusts; there seem respecting Christ's advent nently brought forward and conduct of the believ more so, for the one is which the child of grace the means towards the att

We may lay it down as those who deny ungodlines siah's advent; for if men darkness, they continue i they know not that the nig the day is at hand; for t the waiting for Christ, S two great characteristics "How ye turned to God living and true God, *an from heaven.*" But in th wish for the event is impli in the probability of its im

* The word in 1 Thess again in the New Testame

uch thoughts for a moment,
with thanksgiving that my
l to see the truth upon this
one hath immortality—and
ıtient continuance in well-
ɔnor and immortality, shall
t at death, but in the glo-
resurrection. O! of what
e Resurrection! Dark in-
be without it.
e bid adieu to such poetic
e saint at death *robed in*
having angelic wings so-
stars and singing praises to
left for verse when a friend
s. There is the peaceful
e hid with Christ in God"—
on—and the mortal *then*
. These, and many more,
and noble, worthy a more
ɔen than those which have
le lot. But, I commenced
ying a few words only, and
ughts to a full letter.
hope, A. C. JUDSON.

fus Wendell.

rie, N. Y., Oct. 22, 1856.
- Having used the *nom de*
Jr." as long as my sense of
o so, allow me in the next
readers that the articles
ɔe current volume, are from
import of our Lord's words
ɔ 20th) I do not see that
en Bro. Grew and myself
least for the present. Bro.
his month's issue contains
ɔurse in question, and as
l last in the argument, I
t stands—commending to
l candid consideration *all*
on *both sides*. The "mis-
y brother thought it "ne-
s last reply, has at no time
If Bro. G. will read my
ɔ more care, he will readily
ng to say that he "has lost
37, 38 as proving the re-
l," and *another* and *different*
ɔse passages constitute the
fidence" in such revival:
—the latter I have not. In
this sentence—"This I
ɔjudiced reader will see,
not." By these words no
brother was intended, but
in his last reply leads me
per, I withdraw them. I
nd against the divine pre-
n this connection I should
shaked in the conviction
o the Sadducees are "*posi-*
cked dead will" *not live*

pon 2 Tim 1: 10, besides
ion, are, as I judge, very
but of this more at another
RUFUS WENDELL.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, NOVEMBER 15, 1856. NO. 22.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year;

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE CHURCH'S EXPECTATION.

BY GEORGE DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

In a former chapter I stated what appeared to be certain characteristic features of this dispensation; I proceed now to point out what I conceive should be the longing anticipation of the Church with regard to the future.

"The grace of God which bringeth salvation" teacheth us, "that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." If now, a man denied worldly lusts, and lived soberly and righteously, but yet was not godly—if he fulfilled all the duties of the second table, yet neglected the duties of the first—we should not hesitate to say that such a man was not taught by that grace of God which bringeth salvation: a man truly under the teaching of the Spirit cultivates both godliness and righteousness. But is this all that the grace of God, which bringeth salvation, teacheth? No; it also teaches us to be "expecting .... the glorious appearance of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," and, apparently, the text implies, that this expectation is as certainly and as universally taught, as is the denial of ungodliness and worldly lusts; there seems no difference; the hope respecting Christ's advent appears quite as prominently brought forward as the characteristic life and conduct of the believer,—indeed, I should say more so, for the one is introduced as the end at which the child of grace is aiming; the others are the means towards the attainment.

We may lay it down as a proposition, that only those who deny ungodliness can be expecting Messiah's advent; for if men cast not off the works of darkness, they continue in a state of darkness; they know not that the night is far spent, and that the day is at hand; for the service of God, and the waiting for Christ, St. Paul gives us as the two great characteristics of true conversion:—"How ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, *and to wait for his Son from heaven.*" But in this *waiting*, an anxious wish for the event is implied, as well as the belief in the probability of its immediate occurrence.*

Taken conversely, the proposition is equally true. Those who are expecting Messiah's advent do deny ungodliness and worldly lusts; the expectation has a purifying efficacy: "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and [or but] it doth not yet appear what we shall be." We are now in possession of this most exalted privilege, although the present is not the season when the sons of God are manifested: the world now knows them not, any more than when He was on earth it knew Him. "But," says St. John, "we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." I understand the last clause not as assigning the cause, but affirming the proof, of our resemblance; it is not the transforming power of the beatific vision, but the discerning power of the beatified spirit. To see Him as He is, to know Him even as we are known, argues an exaltation of our nature commensurate with the glorified humanity of the Son of God; "and every man that hath this hope in Him, [*i. e.* in Christ,] purifieth himself even as He is pure." Every one who has this exalting, exhilarating hope of being made like unto Christ at his glorious appearing, does now strive after, and in some measure attain unto, that purity which is in Christ himself. Hence St. Paul urges it, as the great motive to mortification: "When Christ our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory. *Mortify, therefore*, your members which are upon earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness which is idolatry."

The passage which I have quoted from St. John's epistle, seems to refer rather to the expansion of the intellectual and spiritual capacity of the glorified believer; but there must also be a spiritual body—a body capable of being actuated immediately by the glorified spirit—a body of glory suitable for the perfected spirit. Such was St. Paul's expectation; and in setting forth his walk as an example, in opposition to that which

---

* The word in 1 Thess 1: 10 does not occur again in the New Testament; but it is found in the septuagint version of Job 7: 2, where the patriarch says, "As a servant earnestly desireth the shadow, and as a hireling *looketh for* [the reward of] his work, so am I made to possess months of vanity, and wearisome nights are appointed me."

"The compound word here used in the original denotes intensity. We not only await Him, expect Him, and are persuaded that He will come, but stay patiently and eagerly for his coming; we endure, because we long for it, and are sure that we shall not be disappointed."—*Vaughan, Church's Expectation, p.* 11.

ends in destruction, he implies that this desire of Christ's appearing, and of the consequent transformation into his likeness, was a great impelling motive to heavenly conduct, "for our conversation is in heaven; from *whence also we look for the Saviour*, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall *transform our bodies of humiliation*, in order that they may be fashioned like unto his body of glory." To attain to the hope, and to live in the expectation of the advent, is, in short, that which characterizes those who are not deficient in any spiritual gift. "I thank my God . . . for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ; that in every thing ye are enriched by Him . . . so that ye come behind in no gift; *waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*."

St. James speaks of patience as being the crowning and completing grace of the Christian, so that however perfect he might be, were he not placed in such circumstances as would elict and call into exercise the grace of patience, he would be wanting in something; and so great would be the want, that the believer should joyfully exchange a state of peace for one of manifold trials, in order that he might have the opportunity of exercising this grace. "But," adds he, "let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing." What, however, can fortify the believer, and enable him to endure in the exercise of this perfecting grace, but the expectation of the Lord's speedy return? The same apostle says, "Be *patient*, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord: behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain, Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts, *for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh*." St. Paul holds out precisely the same motive in support of the same grace: "Ye have need of *patience*, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise; for yet a *little while*, and He that shall come will come, and will not tarry." In both these passages the consideration of the Lord's speedy advent to put an end to suffering and trial, is held out as the support of patience. And in neither of them is there a hint of a period of spiritual peace and triumph prior to the advent.

Precisely the same thought is held out for the consolation of those under bereavement: "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others who have no hope; for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jeses will God bring with Him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive [and] remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive [and] remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we be ever with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." To me it appears evident that the special ground of comfort here urged, is the prospect of speedy reunion with the departed brethren; and that, not by our being absent from the body, and so present with the Lord, but by the return of Christ together with those who sleep in Jesus. Here, then, evidently, the whole consolation consists in the probability of Messiah's speedy return.

This language of the apostle seems to have taken such hold of the Thessalonians, that their desire for the Lord's return amounted to an error in the way of excess rather than of defect; for in his second epistle, St. Paul prays that the Lord would direct their hearts into "*the patient waiting* for Christ." Such, apparently, was their ardent desire for his advent, that it almost trenched upon the grace of patience. How very different is the condition of the Church now from what it was then! the Apostle having to rein in their ardor; whereas our sluggishness needs much goading.—But with those who have the assurance of hope, and are living in the sense of God's favor, the Thessalonian would be the more likely state of the two; they would be hoping "for the grace which is to be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ;" those whose conversation is in heaven are looking from thence "for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ," and in all holy conversation and godliness not only looking for, but "*hastening on*, the coming of the day of God." * * * *

It is distinctly said that the crown of righteousness "is laid up for . . . *all those that love his appearing*," and not only so, but apparently it is *only* for those, for it is "*unto them that look for Him*," that He will appear "unto salvation." In that day the Church will say, "Lo, this is our God, *we have waited for Him*, and He will save us; this is Jehovah, *we have waited for Him*, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." The iteration seems to mark that the waiting was an evidence that his appearing would be to their joy.

I have now stated what I apprehend should be the expectation of the Church, and the blessed effects of that expectation upon the disposition and conduct of the believer. I will now show some of the evil consequences upon the character of those who profess to be followers of the Lord, but yet who do not live in this attitude of expectation.

In the "perilous times" of "the last days," covetousness will be a leading feature among men who have the form of godliness while denying the power, but such men cannot be living upon the contemplation of Christ's speedy return, for nothing can be so effectual against the snare of covetousness as the expectation of Messiah's advent, for it is the thought which enables one to sit loose to the world, and which frees from all anxiety. "Let your moderation be known unto all men. *The Lord is at hand, be careful for nothing*."

Our Lord also intimates that some of his servants will be fostering a spirit of persecution, and indulging fleshly lusts, just because they say in their hearts, "My Lord delayeth his coming;" upon which He urges watchfulness; for those only who watch and pray always will be accounted worthy to escape; so our Lord says again, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." And those who do watch for his advent

are blessed: "Behold, I come as a thief, *blessed is he that watcheth.*" The whole point and force would be taken away from the exhortation to watchfulness, if we admitted that there was to be a spiritual millennium intervening before the second advent; the idea intended to be conveyed seems to be the possibility, if not the probability, of Messiah's return within the period of a natural life.—"The end of all things is at hand, be ye *therefore* sober, and watch unto prayer."

A similar exhortation, "Let us watch and be sober," is grounded just upon the fact of light or darkness upon this point being the distinguishing mark of the believer: "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief;" the "but" here is a particle of opposition by which St. Paul distinguishes the brethren from others. The son of Jonas in like manner makes wilful ignorance the characteristic of the wicked scoffers in the last days, attributing to them this inquiry, "Where is the promise of his coming?" Hence he expressly warns the beloved not to fall into this error of the wicked.

The expectation of the Lord's advent has always been the aspect of the true Church: it was so in the apostolic days; it was so with the fathers for the first three centuries; and it was so with the Reformers. Our Church, therefore, teaches us to say, "*I look for* the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come." We do not merely state our belief that there will be a resurrection of the dead some time or other—a thousand years hence, or even a year hence; but we declare that we are in the attitude of hope and expectation: "I look for it"—I know neither the day nor the hour.

The notion of a spiritual millennium which originated apparently by the *oscillation* into the opposite extreme, from the excesses of the German Anabaptists and English Fifth Monarchy Men, has since been fostered by the expectations raised from the efforts of religious societies, till it has become the deliberate creed of many. Thus we are enabled to understand how it can be used by our Lord and St. Peter as a prophetical feature and sign of the last days. I do not mean to imply that carelessness or indifference alone, upon the subject of the Lord's return, could be considered a prophetic sign—for that, I fear, has been the melancholy feature in most ages of the Church—but the deliberate maintenance of a doctrine which virtually says "My Lord delayeth his coming," is a prognostic of the speedy approach of Messiah. Now, we before observed, that a man who holds the spiritual millennium cannot be expecting the advent of the Lord: is he not, then, saying in his heart, "My Lord delayeth his coming?" And of what is such a belief the forerunner?

Shortly, then, to recapitulate this chapter. We may be confident, that an expectation—which is taught by the grace of God—which is a sign of true conversion—which is purifying in the highest degree—which shows itself in all holy conversation and godliness—which is a mark of the highest spiritual knowledge—which therefore characterises those for whom the crown is laid up, * *.* is holy in its tendency—is in accordance with the divine Mind, and is a point of great practical importance. On the other hand, that ignorance upon this subject—which is wilful—which betokens a child of darkness—which encourages a covetous disposition—which fosters a persecuting spirit—which unbridles the animal desires—and which will end in sudden destruction—is to be reprobated and carefully avoided.

My second conclusion, therefore, is, that the Church ought, according to the Scripture, to be "looking for the glorious appearing of the great God and Saviour," which conclusion being inconsistent with the belief of an antecedent spiritual millennium, confirms our former inference, drawn from the character of the present dispensation.

I have shown, that during this present dispensation, the enemies of Christ and his Church are in the ascendant; and that the Church is, or ought to be, looking for the return of the Lord.

EXPEDIENT FOR LOVING AND FORGIVING.—Man has an unfortunate readiness, in the evil hour, after receiving an affront, to draw together all the moon-spots on the other person into an outline of shadow, and a night piece, and to transform a single deep into a whole life; and this only in order that he may thoroughly relish the pleasure of being angry. In love, he has fortunately the opposite faculty of crowding together all the light parts and rays of its object into one focus, by means of the burning glass of imagination, and letting its sun burn without its spots; but he too generally does this only when the beloved, and often censured, being is already beyond the skies. In order, however, that we should do this sooner and oftener, we ought to act like Wincklemann, but only in another way. As he, namely, set aside a particular half hour of each day for the purpose of beholding and meditating on his too happy existence in Rome, so we ought daily or weekly to dedicate and sanctify a solitary hour for the purpose of summing up the virtues of our families, our wives, our children, and our friends—and viewing them in this beautiful crowded assemblage of their good qualities. And, indeed, we should do so for this reason, that we may not forgive and love too late, when the beloved beings are already departed hence, and are beyond our reach.—*Jean Paul Richter.*

RELIGION ABROAD.

There is no country in the world where emissaries of the pope are not at work extending his empire. The aggregate number of his spiritual subjects is estimated at 160,000,000; while the number of Protestants amounts only to 85,000,000, and that of Greek Christians to 70,000,000. All these 160,000,000, mostly belonging to civilized nations, are ordered to believe only what the pope defines; to read only what he permits, and to obey only those spiritual leaders whom he appoints.—When did another mortal man see such an amount of power concentrated in his hand? And what temptation must it be for the newly-elected pope, if, for the first time, the tempter shows to him al-

the kingdoms of the world, prostrated at his feet, and the glory of them, and promises to him, "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." History bears ample testimony, how great a part in rearing up the colossal edifice of popery is due to the energy of ambition.

When Pius IX. ascended the Papal See, he found the Roman Church in a condition of great weakness. But a few of the smaller Catholic governments and nations respected his authority; the larger ones seemed to care more for preventing encroachments of Rome than for extending its influence. Pius IX. began his career as a reformer; an unusual spectacle on the See of St. Peter, which procured to the Holy Father the unexpected applause of anti-ultramontane statesmen like Thiers, and frightened the "old fogies" in his own Church. The difficulties, however, which soon arose from these attempts, showed that Pius lacked both ability and courage to carry through a reform. The Roman Church would hardly have made considerable progress under this pontificate, if the year 1848 had not proved so powerful an ally. It frightened princes, politicians, and a portion of the European people back into Romanism, or, at least, into an alliance with it. Pius IX. has not known even, how to use the favorable opportunity itself. If the Roman Church is at present somewhat stronger than formerly, it is all due to the force of circumstances, to the patronage of France and Austria, and to the labors of a few eminent men, whom Protestant literature and civilization have helped to educate.

After these few preliminary remarks on the power of popery and the present pope, we invite our readers to cast a glance over the various governments and nations of the world in their present relation to Rome. We endeavor to give on this subject the views entertained by Rome itself. The eye of the pope rests with a particular delight on France and Austria, the two great Catholic powers of Europe. *The Emperor of Austria* is considered as one of the sincerest Catholic princes; only his youth, and the large Protestant population of his empire, hinder, for the present, the display of his whole zeal for the Catholic cause. High praise is bestowed also on *the Emperor of France* for his services to the cause of religion; yet in private circles, it is deemed exceedingly strange, that Louis Napoleon refuses to abrogate the obnoxious Ecclesiastical Law of France, and to conclude a new concordat, but persists, on the contrary, in conferring, what he confers, as a personal favor, and in leaving the path open to his successor. The French Church is considered as the most active and useful section of Catholicism. *The princes of Italy* are doing their best to please the pope, with the exception of *the King of Sardinia*, who has been to be excommunicated for carrying through a reform to which the pope objected. The Church is weak; everybody sees it. She is just as much afraid as the princes of dispensing with the support of French, Austrian, and Swiss bayonets. In *Spain* and *Portugal*, ministry and legislature have been for some years on very ill terms with the pope, although they console him from time to time, by authorising new persecutions against Protestants.—The Church is in the deepest lethargy there, but hopes to regain some influence on the government, by stirring up the lower classes of the people, and enlisting in her cause the old landed aristocracy. The Queen of Spain is known to sanction very reluctantly any measure against the Vatican, since, in her obedience to the pope, she is as unwavering as she is in her highly offensive mode of life; the young King of Portugal shows as yet no sympathy with the endeavors of the ultramontane party. In *Switzerland*, only five among twenty-two cantons are controlled by the Catholic party; the position of the church in general is most unfavorable, and her only trust is in the patronage of France and Austria. *Belgium* is the only constitutional State whose ministers are members and the organ of the ultramontane party. The Protestant King Leopold will, ere long, be succeeded by a Catholic son, who, it is expected, will equal in zeal the Emperor of Austria. This section of the Church is largely contributing to the propagation of Catholicism abroad. In *Holland*, whose government is at present conducted by zealous Protestants, Popery has enough to do in frustrating the efforts which numerous and active Protestant societies are making for the conversion of Roman Catholics. *Prussia* is considered as almost a model Protestant State, because it has made this year new concessions to her Catholic bishops. The Catholic population of Prussia, is, owing to the excellent system of instruction, the best educated people of the Roman Church. Papal affairs in general are in a very prosperous condition. In *Bavaria*, King Lewis, the most ultramontane, and, at the same time, the most profligate among the European Princes, has been succeeded by Maximilian II., who appoints more Protestant than Catholic professors to the two Catholic universities of the land. He is thought to be secretly a decided enemy to popery. The land, however, continues to be one of the strongholds of Romanism in Germany. The Protestant governments of *Baden* and *Wurtemberg*, urged by Austria, and, we have reason to believe, also by Protestant Prussia, are on the point of conceding to the Church almost everything she demands. The conclusion of their new concordat is expected before the close of the present year. Here, as well as in *the other parts of Germany*, Popery is visibly progressing. No government can be more detested in Rome than that of *England*, the powerful patron of Protestant interests all over the world. Rome feels deeply that it is England which most successfully opposes her aggrandizement in all the five large divisions of the world. The Roman Church of England has to exhaust her entire strength in a defensive war; she loses thousands of her people by the exertions of Low Church and Dissenting societies, while the number of Puseyists who come over to her, counts, at most, by dozens. Ireland is still the fertile nursery of Romish priests for the colonial territory of England and the United States of America; but a feeling of deep resentment goes through the land, on account of the many insults which her nationality has received from Rome. *Sweden, Denmark and Norway*, count together but a few thousand Romanists. In Denmark, they enjoy the patronage of the present king; report several conversions, and

have established the first
riodical. In Norway tha
erty, while in Sweden the
notwithstaning the queen
belong to their Church.
of Russia is eulogized fo
of the grievances of th
having opened negotiatio
cordat, and for being a fr
a quality which Rome is
Catholic governments, wl
lics. In *Turkey*, the infl
is at present predominant
there receive so much ai
man Catholics do from F
ticlar attention is paid t
tional establishments. In
Churches, a (not inconsi
union with Rome. *The*
Catholic king, who, howe
the small number of his

Great fear is entertai
of the growing power an
States, which, it is thoug
to the progress of Rome
people are supposed to
among which, a surplus o
The Church is receiving
Puseyites, but has not pr
tual advance of her flock.
Catholic and tyrannical
Santa Anna, has been su
which confiscates the eccl
does not respect even the
if he enters into a conspir
which shows even a pr
most treacherous of all m
religion. Of the half Ind
South America the pope
does not know whether t
heard of them. The gov
as Guatemala, Costa Ric
very obedient servants of
zil the government is in
and Free Masons, and the
American Bible Society,
testant literature. The
nada and Equador have
expel the Jesuits, and to
rent of religious liberty.

In *Asia* and *Africa*, nu
laboring for the conversio
medans, and thus far, wit
rying through their wor
except, of course, the p
France, Spain, and Portu
idly traced the outlines of
out the world.—*Ch. Advo*

The Dream of C

"Christianity, indeed!"
he looked over his books,
behind the shop. "I am
pocrisy!"

There was a dark frow
man of business as he sp

have established the first Scandinavian Papal periodical. In Norway they have full religious liberty, while in Sweden they are cruelly persecuted, notwithstaning the queen and the queen dowager belong to their Church. The young *Emperor of Russia* is eulogized for having redressed most of the grievances of the Catholic Church, for having opened negotiations respecting a new concordat, and for being a friend of religious liberty, a quality which Rome is delighted to see in non-Catholic governments, while it detests it in Catholics. In *Turkey*, the influence of Catholic France is at present predominant; no class of Christians there receive so much aid from abroad as the Roman Catholics do from France and Austria. Particlar attention is paid to the extension of educational establishments. In the Greek and Armenian Churches, a (not inconsiderable) party desires a union with Rome. *The kingdom of Greece* has a Catholic king, who, however, can do but little for the small number of his Catholic population.

Great fear is entertained at Rome, on account of the growing power and influence of *the United States*, which, it is thought, will be more pernicious to the progress of Rome than even England. Our people are supposed to have innumerable faults, among which, a surplus of backbone is the greatest. The Church is receiving some accession from the Puseyites, but has not priests enough for the spiritual advance of her flock. In *Mexico*, an eminently Catholic and tyrannical son of the Church, Gen. Santa Anna, has been succeeded by a government which confiscates the ecclesiastical property, which does not respect even the sacred dignity of a bishop, if he enters into a conspiracy against the State, and which shows even a propensity to introduce the most treacherous of all modern heresies, freedom of religion. Of the half Indian States in *Central and South America* the pope complains, that he often does not know whether they still exist; so little is heard of them. The governments of some of them, as Guatemala, Costa Rica, Bolivia and Chili, are very obedient servants of the Church; but in Brazil the government is in the hands of the Liberals and Free Masons, and the emperor is a friend of the American Bible Society, and a protector of Protestant literature. The Legislatures of New Granada and Equador have become so rebellious as to expel the Jesuits, and to praise Luther as the parent of religious liberty.

In *Asia* and *Africa*, numerous missionaries are laboring for the conversion of pagans and Mohammedans, and thus far, without the prospect of carrying through their work in a single dominion, except, of course, the political dependencies of France, Spain, and Portugal. Thus have we rapidly traced the outlines of Popery *as it is*, throughout the world.—*Ch. Advocate.*

The Dream of Caleb Edmonds.

"Christianity, indeed!" said Mr. Edmonds, as he looked over his books, in the little back parlor behind the shop. "I am disgusted with such hypocrisy!"

There was a dark frown upon the brow of the man of business as he spoke these words, and an irritability in his manner of turning over the leaves before him, which spoke of some bad debt troubling his mind, and robbing him of his good temper.

"What is the matter?" asked a cheerful little woman by the fire, at whose side a basket of stockings told of a large family, and a constant demand for stitchery.

"Matter!" echoed the husband, "do you not know that Welsford owes me four pounds, ten and sixpence?"

"Well, he will pay, I suppose?"

"Not he. The goods were purchased more than a year ago, and I have not had a penny yet!"

"What does he say when you see him?" asked Mrs. Edmonds, who evidently loved to look at the bright side.

"*Say!* he does not say much to me, I can tell you. I told him not to worry me with excuses, but to bring his money; and that he need not cross my door-step again until he could do that."

"I am sorry for his wife," said the little stocking-mender, presently; "she appears to be a truly pious woman."

"*Pious!*" retorted her husband, "yes, and so is he, 'tis that disgusts me. Religion, indeed! and he owes me four pounds, ten and sixpence. I thought the Bible said, 'Owe no man anything.' Christianity forsooth!"

Mr. Caleb Edmonds was a highly respectable grocer in the town of Marbly; in fact, a man of substance, for business had prospered with him.—He was industrious and obliging, rising early, working hard; and thus from small beginnings, he had risen to the possession of considerable wealth. But although an excellent man of business, Mr. Edmonds was a very ordinary Christian. True, he had begun the race, but he did not press toward the mark; alas for "the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches!" And, as it is characteristic of a low standard of piety to be harsh and censorious in our judgment of our fellow Christians, so Mr. Edmonds, when he heard of any defect in the character of professors around him, was always the first to exclaim, "Christianity indeed!"

Is not this too common with us all? Do we not, even if we give no expression to our thoughts, doubt and hesitate much more than we should doubt and hesitate, regarding the reality of the religion of our "Ready-to-halts" and "Feeble-minds?" Do we not set up a standard of perfection for our fellows, which were too lofty, in our view, as a standard for ourselves? And are we not too ready to exclaim against the wanderings of others, even while we turn aside into forbidden paths?

Perhaps such thoughts as these had passed through the mind of Mrs. Edmonds, as she sat over her work, for when she rose to leave her basket for some more active household duty, she bent over her husband for a moment, and said gently, "Caleb, I do not like to hear you say '*Christianity indeed!*' as you did just now. Suppose your fellow Christians were to judge of you as harshly as you of them! You often say it," she continued hastily; "you doubted John Watson's religion yesterday, because he lent money to your rival; and Thornton's because he opposes

you in business, and you shook your head about Miss Milwood's piety, because she argued with you against total abstinence! '*Judge not*, that ye be not judged.'"

Long after his wife left him, these words rang in Caleb's ears—"*Judge not.*"

At last, as he sat in the twilight, between sleeping and waking—for business was very dull, and he could spare half an hour for rest—a vision stole upon him, and he passed, in imagination, rapidly through the scenes which follow.

At first he found himself in a very quiet neighborhood, and in the presence of three maiden ladies, whose names he knew very well. They had their feet upon the fender, and, their knitting laid aside, were evidently discussing the affairs of their neighbors.

"Such pride!" said the elder lady, whose name was Rayby; "what will come next I wonder!"

"The most fashionable boarding-school in R., I assure you," said another—Miss Phillip.

"Ah!" said Miss Rayby, "and I can remember the time—of course I was very young then, but still I can remember—when Caleb Edmonds swept out his own shop!"

"Dear me! and now he has the upstart impudence to send his girl to such a school as that!" exclaimed Miss Sophia Milwood, the spinster, who had not yet spoken. "O, the pride of human nature!"

"And he a professor, too!"

"Professor!" said Miss Rayby: "religion does not teach a man such absurd pride as that!"

Miss Phillip shook her head, and began to lament the increase of false professors.

"Well," thought Caleb, "I believed that in spending some of my cash upon the education of my children, I could not go very far wrong; but I find I am misunderstood even here."

The next scene was the drawing-room of John Watson, of whom Mrs. Edmonds had spoken. A lady was making tea behind a silver urn, and a gentleman (her husband) sat beside her.

"Poor Thompson," said Mrs. Watson, for it was she, "I trust he will succeed."

"He shall, if by God's blessing I can compass it."

"He is a very deserving young man," continued the lady; "the manner in which he bore the loss of all his property would win esteem, even if he had no other claim."

Mr. Watson did not reply; his mind had wandered to another branch of the subject. "That Caleb Edmonds," she said at length, "I am surprised at the ill-feeling he displays."

"Toward Thornton?"

"Yes, he is evidently annoyed at the opening of another shop so near his own; whereas, in the principal street of a town like this, he should have expected competition. Besides, he has made a little fortune, and has nothing to fear; yet he will not treat George Thornton with ordinary civility."

"I thought he was a religious man," said Mrs. Watson.

"He pretends to be," replied her husband, "but I have not much faith in a religion which brings forth so little fruit!"

Poor Caleb! his wife's words—the *Master's* words—still sound in his ears as they had never done before, meeting with a responsive echo in his heart.

Again a change, and Mr. Edmonds found himself beside a sickly-looking woman, who, leaning upon her husband's arm, walked slowly toward the house of prayer. It was impossible to look without interest upon her pale and anxious face; a face which once had been beautiful; and equally impossible to disregard the careful tenderness with which her steps were guided by the strong arm at her side. Their conversation, too, was worthy of remark; they were speaking of the consolations of the Gospel.

"Who knows?" exclaimed the invalid, "perhaps there may be words just suited to our case this morning. Words for the poor!"

"Poor as regards this world only, Mary!"

Her eyes brightened as she looked up cheerfully. "Yes, yes, rich in treasure far more costly than earth's gold. God help us to look up, and to trust him for the 'meat that perisheth.'"

They walked on for a while, and then the wife said mournfully: "I sometimes fear that it is pride which makes me shrink from meeting Mr. Edmonds; I *do* shrink from it. O, if we could pay but him!"

"We shall be able to do so soon, I hope," said Welsford; "it has been a hard struggle, Mary, starvation almost, but I think it is nearly over."

"Ah, it was all for me! I am sure Mr. Edmonds would be patient, if he knew how much you spent in medicines for me, and how little work you have."

"He *is* patient, after a fashion; and we have reason to be thankful for that; still he has said some crushing things to me; harsh things, which he may live to repent; things which have made me doubt his Christianity."

"Nay," said Mrs. Welsford, gently, "I would not judge him; how many inconsistent things we do."

"You are right. I may not lift up my voice; alas, but little likeness to my Lord is found in me!"

Again the echoing voice thrilled through the soul of the listener: again he heard the words, "*Judge not!*" and as he dwelt upon them the vision slowly faded, and he, Bunyan-like, awoke, "and behold it was a dream!" But the lesson of the dream was not quite lost upon him, for he awoke to a deeper spirit of Christian charity, a nobler self-denial, a holier humility, a nearer likeness to Jesus. He had been taught in that brief twilight musing, one of the grand old lessons of the Book of God.

The fireside morning worship was just ended, and Charles Welsford was about to go forth to his daily toil, when a gentle knock at the door spoke of a visitor: how great was the surprise of all when Caleb Edmonds entered!

"You come, sir, ——"

"I am come," said the grocer, interrupting him, "to express my hope that you are not under any concern about the little amount you owe me.—Take your time, my good sir; take your time."

The poor man's eyes were filled up with tears, as, grasping the outstretched hand, he tried to speak his thanks.

"My wife," said Mr. Edmonds, turning toward Mrs. Welsford, "put something into my hand, just as I left, for you, ma'am."

And forth from his pockets came tea, sugar, biscuits, from the good wife's ample store, till Mary's eyes, too, filled with grateful tears.

"And now," said the visitor, kindly, "don't forsake the shop; get your little parcels there, and pay just when it suits you. By the way, if a sovereign would be of any service to you, I have one which will burn a hole in my pocket, as the saying goes, unless I give it to somebody." And before they could reply, he had laid the coin upon the table and was gone.

"Mary," said Mr. Welsford, "let us thank God for this."

They knelt, and as he breathed forth his heart's gratitude, his wife wept tears of joy, and even the little ones murmured the "Amen."

But Mr. Edmonds did not stop at this; it was to him Charles Welsford owed a situation which soon after placed him far above the reach of want; it was to him he owed a host of kindly deeds, which came like sunshine to his inmost soul.

We hasten on. Not alone in this regard was Caleb Edmonds changed, for two days after his strange dream, he walked into his rival's shop, shook hands, invited him to drink tea at his house, spoke pleasantly about their "opposition," and even hinted at his own retirement at some future day, when his new friend would have a better chance.

And from that time, the charity which "suffereth long and is kind, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things," held an almost undisputed sway over the heart of Caleb Edmonds; and ever was the maxim of the Bible borne in mind: "*Judge not, that ye be not judged!*"

Death-bed Testimonies.—We must turn elsewhere than to the books of New Testament for death-bed scenes. One beautiful record of the first season of the Church, who prayed for his countrymen, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge," is all that we have of martyrology in the Bible. Its warriors fight the good fight. We know that in some battle or other they finish their course. Where, or how, or under what circumstances of humiliation, or triumph, we are not told. If it pleased God that their lamps should shine out brightly at the last, that was well, for he was glorified in their strength. If it pleased him that the light should sink and go out in its socket, that was well too, for he was glorified in their weakness. Not by momentary flashes does God bid us judge of our fellow creatures; for he who reads the heart and sees the meaning and purpose of it judges not of them by these. And never be it forgotten, that at the death which has redeemed all other deaths and made them blessed, there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour, and that a cry came out of the darkness, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—*F. D. Maurice.*

A Great Cure-All.

Several gentlemen were talking one evening at the house of a friend, when one of them exclaimed, "Ah! depend upon it, a soft answer is a great cure-all." At this state of the conversation, a boy who sat behind a table began to listen, and repeated, as he thought, quite to himself, "A soft answer is a great cure-all." "Yes, that's it," cried the gentleman, starting and turning round; "yes, that's it; don't you think so, my lad?" The boy blushed a little at finding himself so unexpectedly addressed, but answered, "I don't know that I understand you, sir."

"Well, I will explain then. In the days of my boyhood it so happened that, in the school to which I was sent, my seat was next to a lad named Tom Tucker. When I found he lived in a small house behind the academy, I began to strut a little, and talk about what my father was; but as he was a capital scholar, very much thought of by the boys, we were soon on pretty good terms; and so it went on for some time. After a while, some fellows of my stamp, and I with the rest, got into a difficulty with some of the ushers, and some how or other, we got the notion that Tom Tucker was at the bottom of it.

"'Tom Tucker! who is he?' I cried, angrily. 'I'll let him know who I am!' and I went in a passion to Tom, and said, 'I'll teach you to talk about me in this way!' But he never winced or seemed in the least frightened. but stood still, looking at me mute as a lamb. 'Charles,' he said, you may strike me as much as you please; but I shan't strike back again; fighting is a poor way to settle difficulties. I'm thinking when you are Charles Everett, I'll *talk* to you.'

"O what an answer was that! How it cowed me down! So firm, and yet so mild! I felt there was no fun in having the fight all on one side. I was ashamed of myself, my temper, and everything about me. I longed to get out of his sight. I saw what a poor, foolish way my style of doing things was. I felt that Tom had completely got the better of me; that there was power in his principles superior to anything I had ever seen before; and from that hour Tom Tucker had an influence over me nobody ever had before or since; it has been for good, too. That, you see, is the power, the moral power, of a soft answer."

How to be Happier.—Said a venerable farmer, some eighty years ago, to a relative who had lately visited him, "I have lived on this farm for more than half a century. I have no desire to change my residence as long as I live on earth. I have no desire to be any richer than I now am. I have worshipped the God of my fathers with the same people for more than forty years. During that time I have rarely been absent from the sanctuary on the Sabbath, and never lost one communion season. I have never been confined to my bed by sickness a single day. The blessings of God have been richly spread around me, and I made up my mind long ago that if I wished to be happier I must have more religion."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, November 15, 1851.

SUBSCRIBERS wishing to pay personally, or sending by private hands, for the EXAMINER for 1857, may do so to GEO. YOUNG, *agent* for R. T. YOUNG'S *Letter File*, 109 Nassau Street, New York; who is authorized to act for us in the matter.

Our *Office and residence* is at 62 *Hicks Street*, Brooklyn, a short distance from Fulton Ferry, where we shall be happy to see any of our friends.

Two numbers more complete the present volume of the BIBLE EXAMINER. We thank our friends for past favors. We very much wish we could have the number of subscribers that would enable us to reduce the subscription price to $1 for 24 numbers. Nothing short of fifteen hundred paying would do it. Till we obtain that number the terms cannot be less than $2 to single subscribers, while we issue *semi*-monthly.

To encourage early payments—which are much to our advantage—we make the following offers, to such as forward us the cash before December 25th: where papers are sent to *one address*, in the *States*.

For *two* copies $3; for *five* copies $7; for *ten* copies $10.

If either of these offers are accepted, let it be distinctly understood, we send the whole number in one envelope, to one individual; and we do not need the name of any other person.

To single subscribers, who pay $2 before Dec. 25th, we will give *two* copies of either of the following works—the subscriber to pay the postage on them—*viz:* "MAN'S DESTINY;" "DOBNEY ABRIDGED;" "THE DISCUSSION" with Prof. Mattison; or, we will give one copy of "BIBLE VS. TRADITION," in paper cover, and pay the postage on it ourself. If any prefer, *instead* of either the foregoing offers, a copy of the "*Revised and Enlarged* SIX SERMONS" we will give them that; but they must pay the postage on it.

Money sent for the BIBLE EXAMINER is at *our risk*, provided the letter is sealed with a wafer and directed as follows—

GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New York.*

☞ Take care to put no other words or figures in the direction, as it will be at *your risk* if you do.

BOUND EXAMINERS FOR 1856.—Persons who wish the BIBLE EXAMINER *bound* for this year must let us know by Dec. 15th, as we do not calculate on binding many volumes. It will be remembered that four numbers of this year are included in our Review of Dr. Post, or "MAN'S DESTINY." As that cannot be bound with the other numbers, on account of its size, the volume will contain but twenty numbers, or 320 pages. We shall put the bound volume, therefore, at $1.50. To persons who send us $2 for the next volume, and do not claim either of the other premiums we have offered, we will give the bound volume of this year for $1. But let us have your orders immediately, if you intend to accept this offer. Let it be understood, in this case, the postage on the volume is to be paid by the purchaser, which will be about 25 cents, if *prepaid*.

A few bound volumes for 1855 can still be had of us at $1.50.

IMPERFECT numbers of the EXAMINER may have been received by some of our subscribers during this year: if so, please let us know it, and we will send you perfect ones in their place, without charge. We endeavor to be careful in this matter, but imperfect ones sometimes, possibly, escape us.

"AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN."—Such is the name of a new weekly paper issued in Philadelphia; Rev. BENJ. J. WALLACE, Editor, with ALBERT BARNES and several others for *Associates*. It is a large folio, with seven columes to the page: is a handsome sheet, and appears to bid fair to be a most useful paper for the Presbyterians of America. We wish it all possible success in doing good.

"TRUE WESLEYAN."—This paper has changed its *Editor*. L. C. MATLACK, its previous Editor, having become "President of the Illinois Institute," at Wheaton, Ill. Success to him in his new vocation. Rev. CYRUS PRINDLE is now Editor of the *True Wesleyan*. With Br. Prindle we have had a pleasing acquaintance in former years. We entertain for him the most sincere respect, and therefore rejoice that he occupies his present relation to the *Wesleyan;* though we differ materially on theology. That difference, on our part, shall not prevent our christian regard for him.

CHANGES.—The following remarks close an article in the *True Wesleyan*, from M. STOW, Weybridge, Vt., on the cry "Never change Politics or Religion." They are worthy to be placed in large characters in every public place. To the sentiments we respond most fully.

"There are two classes in community. The one that say 'we never change,' and leave us to think

they can have little use for their eyes, ears, reason or conscience, and must act the part of the slave to their Church or Party, which may change at pleasure, they will follow in the wake as long as their party adheres to the original name and be satisfied; but in point of fact change, rather are changed by others, as often as the other class, whose changes are the result of reflection and study, and a conviction of wrong. This latter class think, and that justly too, that a change would improve their position, and give them an opportunity to be more useful, rid themselves of error, and in so doing, be enabled better to render service to God and man. May heaven bless this last class, and increase their graces and numbers."

"IN HEAVEN AN HOUR"

The *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, (Methodist Episcopal,) speaking of the death of Dr. Watson, says—

"On the evening of the 16th he dictated about half a column of matter found in this issue. On the morning of the 17th he expressed a wish to dictate more in the afternoon, at four o'clock. When that time came he had been in heaven an hour."

The Doctor died, it seems by the account, just before three o'clock; or, as the *Advocate* expresses it, "passed into heaven as gently as the stars of morning go out."

Several thoughts or questions rushed into our mind on reading this article.

1. Where do the Scriptures use such language in recording the death of saints?

2. Did the Doctor "pass into heaven" quicker than David? Peter, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, said, on the day of Pentecost, "David is not ascended into the heavens:" but David died a *thousand years* before. The *Advocate* found Dr. Watson "in heaven" the very moment of his death: he outstript David a long time, it seems.

3. Why are Christians of these days so much wiser than the Bible? That book represents the dead saints as having "fallen asleep;" and never as going to heaven at death.

4. If the representation of the *Advocate* be correct, then the record of the death of saints, or their approach to it, could be amended by the substitution of the phrases which the Advocate uses and make sense. Let us try it.

"An evil beast hath devoured him: Joseph is without doubt" [passed into heaven]. "I will go down into" [heaven] "unto my son mourning." Gen. 37: 33, 35. "Then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow" [into heaven]. Gen. 42: 38. "It shall come to pass, when he seeth the lad" [Benjamin] "is not with us, that he" [Jacob] "will" [pass into heaven:] "and thy servants shall bring down the gray hairs of thy servant our father with sorrow" [into heaven]. Gen. 43: 31. "So Joseph" [passed into heaven,] "being a hundred and ten years old; and they embalmed *him*, and *he* was put in a coffin in Egypt." Gen. 50: 26.

"The days of David drew nigh that he should" [pass into heaven]. 1 Kings 2: 1. Compare this with Acts 2: 34. "David is *not* ascended into the heavens." "In those days Hezekiah was sick unto" [passing into heaven]. "And Isaiah came unto him, and said, Thus saith the LORD"*** "thou shalt" [pass into heaven] "and not live." *** "And Hezekiah wept sore." Isaiah 38: 1-3. "When thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thine hands, and another shalt gird thee and carry thee whither *thou wouldst not*. This spake Jesus, signifying by what" [passing into heaven] "he should glorify God." John 21: 18, 19. Peter, it seems, "would not" like to go there.

"Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely" [pass into heaven,] "because we have seen God. But his wife said unto him, If the LORD were pleased to" [pass us into heaven] "he would not have received a burnt-offering and a meat-offering at our hands." Judges 13: 22, 23. "Epaphroditus was sick nigh unto" [passing into heaven]: "but God had *mercy on him*;" &c. Phil. 2: 27.

"Jesus said unto them plainly, Lazarus is" [passed into heaven]. "Then said Martha to Jesus, Lord if thou hadst been here my brother had not" [passed into heaven]. "Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall" [come out of heaven] "again." They came to the grave. "Jesus said, Take ye away the stone. Martha, the sister of him that was" [gone into heaven] "saith unto him, Lord by this time he stinketh for he hath been" [in heaven] "four days."***"Then they took away the stone, where" [he that was gone to heaven] "was laid." Jesus "cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And he that was" [in heaven] "came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes," &c.

These samples are sufficient to show the unscriptural method some persons have in expressing themselves in relation to those who have "fallen asleep in Christ," and who await "the resurrection, at the last day."

Such language as that employed in the *Advocate*, never occurs in the Scriptures of truth: and the direct tendency of it is to inspire false hopes, and to deceive the living in relation to the dead. Such teaching it is that has made void "the resur-

rection of the dead" in Christ," and led to the spirit-rapping delusion of these last days.

If our voice could be heard, we would entreat all Christians to speak on this subject as "the oracles of God," that they may not any longer discredit the resurrection, nor lend their influence to spirit-rapping. It is not agrecable to us to find fault with those who love the Lord Jesus Christ; but we beg of them to use Scripture language when they speak of death. Death is nothing desirable. It cannot be to any enlightened mind. It is "the *last enemy*," which is only to be divested of its deadly power by "the resurrection at the last day." Till then it holds "dominion" over those, even, "who have fallen asleep in Christ." At that day, shall the saints arise from the dead victorious and triumphant. They die, or fall asleep, in "hope" of that victory "at the last trump." Till then they do not "ascend into the heavens:" David did not, and there is not a *promise* in the Bible that any other saint shall "pass into heaven" at death.

We have made the foregoing remarks with no hostile feelings towards those who employ the unscriptural language we have spoken of; nor with any lack of charity towards them. We know too well the power of phraseology with which we have been familiar from our youth; especially as connected with those we love, who have fallen asleep in death. Our love for these slumbering ones leads us, without due consideration, to think them "in heaven," because we dislike to think of them as really in an unconscious state. But an unbiased examination of Scripture will lead us to see that we have no authority to look for "comfort" concerning them except in the "return" of Christ "*from* heaven," and their "resurrection at the last day:" "for the Lord *himself* shall descend *from* heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and *the dead in Christ* SHALL RISE first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds to MEET the Lord in the air; and *so* shall we ever be with the Lord.—Wherefore *comfort one another with these words.*" 1 Thess. 4: 16–18.

Such is Bible ground of comfort; and such is the hope of the Gospel; and no authority from the Scriptures is given for speaking of the saints, who have fallen asleep in Christ, as being "*in heaven.*" No: it is a "tradition of men." Shall this tradition be suffered still to blind our minds to the glories of the resurrection by "the Lord Jesus Christ, our hope?"

The Bible vs. Creeds.

We cut the following remarks from an article in the *Christian Advocate*, of this city, of January last, written by Rev. A. STEVENS, on the "*Religion of Germany.*" We have given the extract to show the importance of the Bible to a right faith and experience. To that Book alone must be all our appeals if we would have our faith founded on the rock, and our experience a *Christian* one. Mr. Stevens says:—

I have given you some details showing the resuscitation of true faith in several sections of Germany. Wurtemburg has especially shown signs of spiritual life. I am happy to confirm my former references to that garden spot of the new German "evangelism" by the testimony of a Scotchman—of the Free Church, and therefore no "latitudinarian"—the late Rev. Mr. Mackintosh. He says: "I have never known, nor expect to know, a finer developed people than the Christians of Wurtemburg. *They have the advantage of learning their Christianity rather from the Bible than confessions, and so it takes a healthy, simple, undoubting form*, which, with us, [Scotchmen,] too often, by gentle and simple, is wanting. Not that our folk study the confession for themselves—no, they read their Bibles; but it is the teaching of the school and of the pulpit so unceasingly that colors all their views; and so, in general, reduces the matter to one dead level, where it would be hard to say, if asked, which is the cardinal doctrine of Christianity. *The Bible, if read in its own light, leaves one in no doubt about it.* It is *Jesus Christ* manifest in the flesh, suffering on the cross, received up into glory, and, for the sinner; all others should have weight as they have more or less nearly to do with this.***The awakened sinner does not know at first whither to turn—to election, or to what; and perhaps only after a long searching is Christ himself, he knows not how, presented to his eyes, exhumed, as it were, from this long and artfully-linked *catena*. How beauful the confidence of the Christian's approach to God here—*Lieber Vater!* he cannot doubt, for his love sent Jesus—*Der treuer Heiland!* We have still very Jewish, distant, and awful thoughts of God. We see him not enough in the Son, and have very few and imperfect thoughts of the Son, who yet must be *our life*. The other 'doctrines,' as we call them, if they do not shut him out, keep him in the background as effectually as do the 'saints' of the Roman Catholic Church. When will it be otherwise? and our religion become a more simple and a more *loving* one? This will only be when we adhere to the Bible as the text-book more closely in school and pulpit, and learn our Christianity and theology there, where everything has its due prominence. *I recognize this as the grand result of German experience;* and yet it is but a return to the principle of the Reformation—too soon, however, abandoned. Now, as then, and ever, the Bible must be mighty to the pulling down of strongholds, (be they what they may,) and the building up of a sound and living

piety. There was long, and still is, a tendency, favored by Schleiermacher, and even the Moravians, to detach Christ from the Bible; but the evil consequences of this are seen—*and now a Bible, that is, a Christian, theology is the cry.*"

These are remarkable thoughts for a Calvinist, but they are just such as force themselves upon every mind that looks profoundly into the tendencies of religious opinion in these formerly Calvinistic countries.

PRESENT AND FUTURE KNOWLEDGE.

BY THE EDITOR.

"For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as I also am known."—1 Cor. 13: 12.

The present and future states are here presented. The first as an imperfect one, and the other as "perfect," verse 10. "Now" we occupy the first state, even the best of us; for Paul did not except himself, who surely might have been, if any one.

"That which is perfect" (v. 10) is future—yet to come. If an apostle thus speaks of himself, in contrasting the knowledge of the two states, how much more does it become us—who never had the same means of knowledge—to speak of our present attainments with modesty, and in charity for others. Charity, or love, is the grace which the apostle is specially enforcing in this chapter; and the description he gives of it and its value is worthy of deep consideration by all. Without it, the highest eloquence is but as "sounding brass:" without it, the most perfect knowledge of mysterious subjects would avail us nothing: without it, the most miracle working faith is nothing to our real advantage: without it, the most extensive distribution of our goods to the poor would avail us nothing: without it, zeal for truth, which should lead us to martyrdom, would "profit nothing." This charity is a grace that is "kind"—not "boastful"—not "envious"—does not lead to doing that which "causeth shame"—it is not exclusive, to seek only its "own"—it is "not passionate"—"thinketh no evil" where none appears—it "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in *the truth*"—it "beareth all things," *i. e.*, all the weaknesses, &c., of others—it "believeth all things, hopeth all things, and endureth all." It "will never cease," (Syriac) "but prophesyings will end, and tongues be silent."

Such is the character, value, and durability of charity, or love. It is pure and perfect in its nature; and stands first, or chief, in the true Christian character; so that if this be wanting nothing else will avail us. But knowledge now is imperfect: i. e., we know but "little of much" that may be known, and that will hereafter be made clear. Our present imperfection, or abridgement of knowledge, forms a claim on us all for the exercise of charity to the full extent the apostle has described and defined.

"Then," in our text, refers to that "perfect" state (v. 10) when our imperfect knowledge shall be succeeded by clearness. Hence that state can be no other than the kingdom of God, yet future. There is to be "no night there:" knowledge will be "perfect." Not that all will be known, immediately on entering there, that ever can be; but, whatever subject we are called to exercise our minds upon, we shall see and understand without liability to error, as we are now: doubt will not disturb us, as now, as to the correctness of our conceptions. "Now," in this present state, "we see through a glass darkly," or but imperfectly. We see and know now as by a mirror—and that an imperfect one—which gives us not the very things themselves, but only a reflection of the realities. So that while we obtain some knowledge, it is more or less imperfect from the imperfection of the medium through which it is received. But "when that which is perfect is come"—the mirror, or glass, dispensed with, so that we see the reality itself—"then" we "shall know even as" we "also are known:" error will cease, and we shall see all things clearly and truly. Such is to be the future state, or the knowledge attained by those who are accounted worthy to obtain that inheritance.

We shall now proceed to notice

I. SOME OF THE THINGS CONNECTED WITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE FUTURE STATE, OR THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

1. *We may expect perfect light.* Our Teachers will not be erring and imperfect mortals, but endowed with a clear and purified intellect, grasping by intuition any and every subject presented for contemplation. Under such Instructors there will be no chance for error.

2. *Then we shall have perfect faculties.*—"Now" we are enfeebled in all our faculties. Our understanding is darkened, and our judgment warped, oftentimes, from various and unavoidable causes; causes over which we had no control, and from which—for a time at least—we could not possibly extricate ourselves. Our bodily organization is now more or less deranged, and often has an overpowering and irresistable influence on our mental operations, so that imperfection in knowledge is unavoidable. Sincerely as we may desire

freedom from error, and clear conceptions of truth, we cannot always arrive at it; especially in its unmixed form.

But "then," in that "perfect" state, mortality will have been exchanged for immortality: our organization made perfect—all derangement at an end—every faculty will have free and untrammeled exercise; the judgment cannot be turned aside, because the understanding is unclouded and the perception clear and certain. Knowledge will not then be sought by painful means, or tiresome research, but will, probably, arise spontaneously on the presentation of the object or subject for contemplation. But we pass to notice—

II. SOME OF THE SUBJECTS OF FUTURE KNOWLEDGE.

A more clear and full knowledge—

1. *Of God the Father.* That our knowledge on this topic is painfully imperfect now, no one can doubt, who has ever attempted to think. Moses felt this most keenly when, after all previous manifestations, he cried out, "*I beseech thee show me thy glory.*" The answer he received strikingly illustrates the doctrine of our text. He was informed that "now"—in this present state—such knowledge as he desired could not be obtained—"Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see me and live." Such knowledge as Moses desired could not be endured in our present condition: we can know God but imperfectly "now." His "back parts" only could Moses see. God is now only known by what He has done or is doing. Enough is seen to satisfy the reflecting mind that "He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." "But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away:" then shall we "*see His glory,*" and comprehend God as "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard:" then shall our largest desire after the knowledge of God the Father be gratified; for Christ glorified will be our teacher in this grand acquirement; and "no man knoweth who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him." Luke 10: 22. "Then"—in that future state—we may expect to attain a knowledge of God the Father which shall give us unutterable delight, and be a fountain of inconceivable joy. No more painful inquiries will disturb our bosoms on this glorious theme.

2. "Then"—in that perfect state—shall we have a clearer knowledge of *God's works in creation.* If in our present *dark* state we see enough of them to cause us to exclaim, "How marvelous are Thy works," what may we not expect "then," when we shall no longer "see through a glass darkly?" How must our knowledge increase, and with what satisfaction, when instead of the many doubtful speculations, to which we are now subjected, God's works will all be laid open to the inquiring mind, and we shall see and know the harmony and glory of them without mistake and without doubt?

3. Another subject of future and clearer knowledge, will be *God's ways to us, in His providential dealings, while we were in this state.*

Often we have been *bewildered* in looking at the mystery of His dealings with us; but "hereafter" all will be made plain. Our knowledge will then unravel all, and we shall admire the wisdom, which, we shall then see, ordered "all things well." What satisfaction and consolation must such knowledge produce. "What I do," said Jesus to Peter, "thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter."

4. Another theme of knowledge is *our Lord Jesus Christ.* Truly on this subject now, we "see through a glass darkly;" but "that which is perfect" will "come:" "then" our knowledge of the Son of God will be such as to remove all doubt. We shall have a full and clear knowledge of him—

1.) *As the Fountain of our Life.* We know, indeed, now, theoretically, that "Christ is our life"—and the only fountain of life to the perishing children of Adam—but who comprehends, or sees, except "through a glass darkly," the magnitude or importance of this truth? How all but impossible to conceive that the entire future of our existence, or life, rests on Christ *alone:* that without him there is no future life for any child of Adam! How difficult the conception, and how little we now understand of it: and yet a more amazing fact is connected with it, which is, that Christ will eternally remain the fountain of our life; so that no possible period of eternity to come can ever be reached when Christ will not be just as necessary to our continued existence, or life, as the first hour we entered on immortality! Amazing thought! How little do we know of it "now;" yet we shall know hereafter: "*then* that which is in part shall be done away." "This is the record, that God hath given to us ETERNAL LIFE, and this life is in His Son: he that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." Such is the testimony of God. Could the fountain of this life dry up, the streams would cease to flow, and universal death follow. How important, then, is Christ to all who would live forever. We shall

know the truth herea
enters not into our he
Another fruitful top
be seen in a fulness of
conception now, is—
2.) *The Love of Ch*
This topic is one whic
to which no illustratio
talk of earthly love;
high in rank, and sur
and greatness, rolling
have been led by som
raise the object that h
a partner in their inh
one divesting himself
—thus reducing him
poverty—to raise up
charms, and had naugh
and command attenti
could be found, it w
love of Christ. The
ful, mortal, corruptibl
ings! For such, "th
their "sakes he becam
"the brightness of G
image of his person,"
reputation, and took
vant, and was made i
being found in fashio
self, and became obe
death of the cross."
suffering such as mor
through! What pro
Love: that love whic
anguish that rolled o
saw would overtake
quench. But how lit
derstand of all this.
open up, with its un
know—and it will be
and delight—how muc
love of Christ."
3.) *The glory and*
be another glorious t
plate, and from which
and boundless pleasur
see only "through a
dark view was so glor
James and John, on th
what will it be when
his glory, with all the
and servants? If a
appeared, *alone,* to Jo
overwhelmed the belov

know the truth hereafter with a clearness which enters not into our hearts' contemplation now.

Another fruitful topic of knowledge, which will be seen in a fulness of which we have but a faint conception now, is—

2.) *The Love of Christ in our Redemption.*—This topic is one which defies all comparison, and to which no illustration can do justice. We can talk of earthly love; we can fancy those who were high in rank, and surrounded with worldly honor and greatness, rolling in unbounded wealth, who have been led by some exterior charm to stoop to raise the object that has attracted their love to be a partner in their inheritance; but who ever saw one divesting himself of rank, standing, and wealth —thus reducing himself to scorn, disgrace, and poverty—to raise up one who was without exterior charms, and had naught but her miseries to attract and command attention? Even if such a case could be found, it would not compare with the love of Christ. The objects of his love were sinful, mortal, corruptible, condemned, and dying beings! For such, "though he was rich, yet for" their "sakes he became poor;" and though he was "the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of his person," yet he "made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." He endured reproach and suffering such as mortal never, besides him, passed through! What prompted him to all this?—*Love:* that love which all the waves of sorrow and anguish that rolled over him, and which he foresaw would overtake him, could not and did not quench. But how little do we now know or understand of all this. When the perfect future shall open up, with its unclouded light, then shall we know—and it will be a fruitful field of knowledge and delight—how much and how great was "the love of Christ."

3.) *The glory and Exaltation of Christ* will be another glorious theme on which to contemplate, and from which we shall derive knowledge and bonndless pleasure. Of this, at present, we see only "through a glass darkly;" but if this dark view was so glorious, as presented to Peter, James and John, on the mount of transfiguration, what will it be when he is seen on the throne of his glory, with all the holy angels for attendants and servants? If a view of his glory, when he appeared, *alone*, to John, on the isle of Patmos, overwhelmed the beloved disciple, still in mortality, what shall not that glory be when it can be beheld by saints made immortal? Connect this with the perfect knowledge of all the Son of God passed through, in his love to us, to reach that height of glory, and a clear perception that he is "*worthy*" of the glory, and what a foundation of knowledge and enjoyment must be opened up to our minds therein.

4.) *The Ability of Christ to do for his Followers* will be another theme of contemplation, where knowledge may find stores inexhaustible. It is only by dwelling in that rich store-house that we can ever know its fullness. We perceive now some small outgoings of his power; but they are only as the flashing rays of the early dawn which indicate the approach of the morning sun that is to make glorious the cold earth, and inspire it with heat and life that shall make all animate nature to rejoice. Christ's power to do for his friends has no limit, but is commensurate with their utmost desires and capacities. *To know* this, in the clear light of the "perfect" hereafter! O, what knowledge! and what a fountain of knowledge! "We shall see him as he is, and be like him;" because, "All things are yours, and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." Truly "such knowledge" will be *then* attained as seems *now* "too wonderful for" us.

5. *The value of* LIFE—and *the awfulness of* DEATH, from which we are redeemed, will be subjects of a more full and perfect knowledge hereafter. A life never to be interrupted by death, nor any of those nameless casualties to which we are now subjected, and which so often embitter life, filling it with fear, pain, and sorrow, who can now comprehend its value? Such a life belongs to the future, or "perfect" state. Its real value can only be understood by its actual possession. In such a life, what attainments in knowledge may be expected: how boundless and full must it be. A living, intelligent existence will then be seen in its true value, and be the source of uninterrupted and immeasurable delight and enjoyment.

By the contrast we shall then know and understand the awfulness of death, from which we have been redeemed. When rare sights and great enjoyments are realized, even in this present state, how often do those who have enjoyed them say, to others who did not, "You do not know what you have lost." And not unfrequently they add, "I would not have missed it for the world." What then must that death be, which eternally excludes those who remain under its power—unredeemed—from a participation in the wonders of knowledge and joy of such a life as the future shall be? Can

such a death be otherwise than awful? Is it not a fearful penalty for sin? Does it not possess terror sufficient to awaken the most stupid and hardened? And why does it not thus awaken? Is it not to be feared, one grand reason is, men, by their fellows, are assured they shall live forever—that they "*shall not surely die*" though they pass the present state in sin, and luxuriating in sensual gratifications? They do not believe death is *certain:* they fancy that somehow they shall live forever, though they now live in sin. But death, with its eternal *dominion*, will surely be the portion of all who do not harmonize with God in Christ, the *only Life-Giver*. The awfulness of their fate, however, can only be fully understood and known when the immense value of life is comprehended in the "perfect" state to come. "Then" will all the redeemed know perfectly that which can be known only "in part" now, relating to Life and Death, and that knowledge will be eternally increasing, and the value of the former be ever more and more vivid, while death can never appear less awful, and the folly of those who chose it by living in sin, will continue to be more and more apparent.

6. One other point, suggested by our text, is worthy of attention. It is the more full and perfect knowledge of *The Persons of the Redeemed.* "Then shall I know even as I also am known."

The thought, "Shall I know friends there?" has often come over some minds. Paul has settled that question. The increased state of knowledge forbids it should be otherwise. From Abel to the last of all the redeemed will our knowledge extend; and it seems likely such will be the intellectual perfection, then enjoyed, that we will not need any one to point out the ancient or modern worthies, but we shall recognize them on sight, by intuition. No sooner will an individual be presented to our attention than we shall know who he is and what is his relation to the redeemed. The apostle's language seems to import this: imperfect knowledge has passed away, and clear conceptions of men and things have taken its place—"Then shall I know even as I also am known." If this will be true of Paul, why not equally true of all the redeemed? We think it will be: and what a source of enjoyment will this knowledge be; and how inexhaustable.

After all we have said, "*Now* we see through a glass darkly." How little can our highest thoughts attain towards that future knowledge. We are, at best, as little children now. How are we admonished to exercise "charity," or love towards all around us; we know but little and that little mixed with much imperfection. The time for the "perfect" has not yet come; but we trust it is at hand. In the mean time, let all live under the abiding conviction of our present liability to err, and cultivate that patient spirit towards all men which shall make us to resemble the meek and lowly Jesus: for on our likeness to him depends our future life and the boundless knowledge pertaining to that state.

From Eld. Jacob Blain.

Bro. Storrs:—I have just returned to "sweet home," from a four months' tour in the west. But my home has greatly changed since I left, as my beloved daughter has married and removed to Chicago, and my only son to Rock Island, Ill. Such changes remind me of the blessed hope of the time when, in the soon coming kingdom of Christ, friends will meet to part no more.

I have spent most of the season in Southern Wisconsin, in country places where our reform had never been preached. As prejudice had not shut ears, the people turned out in masses to hear me, and, by gifts and sales, most families obtained our books to read. A few lonely brethren in each place were much revived by hearing the truth, and seeing some convinced to sympathize with them and aid in advancing our good cause. I was kindly treated and helped by brethren, but as only one or two lived in the towns I visited, I could only obtain a little more than traveling expenses, as my journey out was long. I am thankful to my Master for what I was permitted to see of the fruits of my toilsome labors; but from the anxiety to hear and to obtain books, I hope to learn more fully, when Christ comes, that the seed was not sown in vain—"the harvest" is near, and is certain to come.

One sinner gave his heart to God and found peace on hearing the reasonableness of the penalty, and of the blessedness of "eternal life," as offered to the "chief of sinners" through faith in Christ. The tears of many told me the truth had reached their hearts as well as their heads. Some Christians on being convinced that misery and sin were not to be eternal, told me it seemed like a *new conversion* to them.

In all my journey, I found not one out of the churches who believed in endless misery, and many more doubt the truth of the Bible than I heretofore have supposed. They own that the torment system, which they suppose it teaches, has driven them thus to doubt. Among those who believe the Bible, or in future rewards, a general belief prevails that men are to be judged, or receive according to their works; and not understanding such texts, and the tenor of the Bible, they overlook the need of *pardon*, by repentance, and through the *sacrifice* of Christ. Such passages are the refuge of Moralists and Universalists, and I regret that their import has not been more fully explained by teachers. "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain," Gal. 2: 21.

Life is not to be obtained by works, or by so much suffering, for so much sin. "By the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified." Rom. 3: 20; Gal. 2: 16—by no law God ever made, since Adam fell, is Paul's meaning. "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Gal. 3: 10. Brethren, let us take more time to make plain the way of life to ignorant and death-doomed mortals.

Last year I concluded we should labor more in country places, and less in cities and villages, and experience has confirmed my belief that this should be our practice. In my travels this season I scattered over 2,000 books, pamphlets and tracts, mostly to new readers, and in new and distant regions, so I hope for much more good from them than from my preaching. I lectured one Lord's day in Chicago; and as brethren noticed my subject in six papers, and by hand-bills, the noted Theodore Parker, in his deistical preaching to 3,000 in the evening, referred to my notice and theory, and commended it as infinitely better than the common dogma of endless torment, though he hoped for a doom still better—*progress and final happiness for all.* I was glad to hear our views so publicly noticed; but 3,000 going to hear deistical-universalism shows the sad tendency to error in our land. God grant that brethren may see more clearly the comparative importance of our reform, which seems the only antidote for such delusions.

I should like to say more which is encouraging to our efforts, but time forbids at present. Among other things, I saw two leading ministers, one a President of a College, who told me they believed in *destruction*, but as yet fear to preach it. I heard of others in the same state of mind. The leaven is working in the west, and I am encouraged to labor on, though the lot of pioneers is hard. I was the only one who was traveling to spread our views this season in the great State of Wisconsin, except a few seventh-day brethren; and I could hear of but two or three local ministers in the State, who are with us; yet many private brethren are saying, "Come over and help us." A few missionaries are much needed in that and the State of Iowa.

It is my purpose to return to those States about the middle of December, if I can obtain means to travel and sustain my family while in new fields. Losses on books sent out, by failure to pay, and giving away many to ministers and others, will eat up all profits, and I must depend on other resources for support. I should be happy to hear as soon as possible from brethren who have had books, or may wish for any to sell through the winter. I have a large supply of "*Glad Tidings*," and "*Review of Dr. Beecher*," which I should like to send out for sale.

I hope to be able to visit New York before returning west, and should any wish my works that way, by droping me a line, I will bring them.

J. Blain.

Buffalo, N. Y., Nov. 5, '56.

The Christian Advocate and its Editor.—We feel a sympathy for all good men, however they may differ from us: hence we are sorry for our cotemporary, Dr. Stevens, the new editor of the *Advocate*, of this city.

It seems the *notable* Prof. Mattison who abused us so heartily, and we must say maliciously, in that paper, some eighteen months since, at the close of our "*Discussion*" with him, has become Editor of a new paper, somewhere in Central New York. We have not seen that new comer, and know nothing in particular of its character. If Dr. Stevens is abused by it, we shall think nothing strange of the matter. By looking into the *Advocate* of April 5th and 26th of last year, he will find his paper was then the channel of the most false and unprincipled "attacks" on us from the same man that is now "pummel"-ing his "back;" and if he will look into the published "Discussion," pp. 148 and 158, he will see that we addressed two respectful notes to the *then* Editor of the *Ch. Advocate*, asking the simple justice of correcting those misstatements, and that no attention whatever was paid to our requests, but the falsehoods were permitted to pass without a note of dissent by the conductors of that paper.

Wickedly wronged as we knew ourself to be, we were compelled to bear the burden and wait for some other mode in Providence to expose to the readers of the *Advocate* our traducer. We always believed that sooner or later that traducer would meet with the due reward of his wicked deeds; but we are truly sorry that our respected brother editor, Dr. Stevens, should have to bear the sins of those who have preceded him in conducting the *Advocate*. We esteem him, and like the general character of his paper much; but it seems our old *accuser* is laying blows upon his "back," as the following item from the *Advocate* of Nov. 6 indicates.

"Rev. Mr. Mattison continues to take charge of our personal matters, domestic, financial, and official, in his new paper. He gives the census of our family, the amount of our receipts, &c., &c., only he kills off half our children, exaggerates by one-fifth our salary, and makes desperate work with other matters. As Mr. Mattison is quite 'well off' in this world, we ought perhaps to regret his want of sympathy toward us. In our walks in this city we sometimes pass under the shadow of a single item of his property, which would not only buy out all our financial worth, including our last book and the last shred on the editorial back, which he delights so much to pummel, but leave, we suppose, a handsome surplusage besides. He not only possesses vastly more of such 'good creatures' than we, but more than

we ever would possess if we could, for we have long since made a covenant with our own heart on that point. We refer (for the last time) to these matters, for two reasons: One is, that the Methodist public may know the kind of men and kind of organ that would be the self-constituted leaders of our great interests. What would soon become of the whole *morale*, not only of our Church, but of our families, if such were our habitual guides? Second, We have given (in more senses than one) to the Church a book on the Christian use of property. We have reason to believe it is doing some good. These attacks are a virtual impeachment of our design in that work, and, if credited, would tend to destroy its usefulness. We may be permitted, then, to say that the principles of that volume are drawn from our own experience and practice. We adopted its rules long before we ever thought of writing upon them. We have been determined that the great adversary shall never waylay us on that route, whatever he or his assistants may expect to do with us on any other. May the great Head of the Church save it from these internal and degrading abuses."

Thus, it seems, the notable *Professor* makes use of "the editorial back" of Dr. Stevens "to pummel:" but the Doctor would let "the Methodist public know the kind of men and kind of organ that would be the self-constituted leaders of our great interests." The "attacks" of the Professor are, we presume, justly rebuked by the Doctor; and we do not know but the "attacks" are suffered by a retributive Providence on the *Advocate*, for allowing that scandalous matter in its columns against us, of which we complained in vain; but we are sorry that its present Editor has to bear the burden; and he may be assured we feel a sympathy for him, or any other man who has to bear with unprincipled slanderers. May such slanderers be brought to repentance for the wrongs they inflict on their fellow men; and may that repentance lead to a corresponding confession and reparation. Till this is done their sin remains upon them.

"LIFE FROM THE DEAD: *Or, the Righteous only will Live Again.*"—We have not yet received funds or pledges sufficient to warrant us in issuing this work. Some are anxious we should publish it, and about $50 have been paid or pledged towards it. Near $100 more are needed to enable us to go forward with safety. We have nothing of our own to pay the expenses, and we cannot venture in debt to do it. We are willing to give the use of our time and pen, but there our responsibility ends, because we expended long ago all we had, and have distributed gratuitously—when we had funds—thousands of various works. Now it remains for those who have means to do what they think duty requires. We do not intend to importune nor dun any one in these matters. Each has the same interest in scattering information that we have; and each must make such use of their means as their own convictions prompt them to do. We ask nothing and desire nothing but free-will offerings in scattering truth, even. We have stated now the facts about the work—"*Life from the Dead*"—and design to say no more on the subject; but if funds are received or pledges made to meet the expense, the work will be put to press with the least possible delay.

"THE LIGHT: A TREATISE ON *Man's Nature when Created. and the Design of his Creation, as Revealed in the Holy Scriptures.*—Showing—that the living man is the living soul—that no soul is of its own nature immortal—that death is not a modification of life, but the destruction of organization and consciousness—that no soul can be both living and dead at the same moment—and therefore, that man's salvation depends on a resurrection from death. Also—a refutation, and reasonable explanation of all the texts commonly quoted to prove that the soul has consciousness in death—the scriptural plan of salvation and the final punishment of the wicked. By JOHN HURLEY."

The foregoing work is in press and will shortly be out. Of it we cannot speak particularly, as we have seen but little of the matter. We presume we shall not agree with all it contains, yet we wish for it a wide circulation, so far as we can judge from the little we know of it. Br. Hurley is an earnest man, and was formerly a Roman Catholic; more recently Editor of the *Irish Evangelist*. He had thought much on the immortality question before our acquaintance with him; and as he thinks more he will find, as we have done, that some of our first impressions, connected with the subject, were influenced more by our old theological training than from the truth itself, as written in the Bible. On these matters Br. Hurley, with his open mind, will, we think, see "the way of the Lord more perfectly" by-and-by. The work as it is, however, will do good to many who could "not bear" more "now." It is to be an 18mo., of about 150 pages. Price 50 cents, probably. For sale at 168 Bowery, and 177 1-2 Eighth Avenue, New York.

"A. Q., of Philadelphia, is informed that his $5 is received.

S. B. EMMONS, of South Carolina, your $5 also received.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, DECEMBER 1, 1856. NO. 23.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

DIVINE LIFE.

The following article is from the *American Presbyterian*, editorial. We are so much pleased with its general character, and it is so entirely in harmony with our views, that we give it entire. May it be read and laid to heart. However sound any of us may be in our religious theory, *life*, spiritual, future, and external, can only be ours by that divine life dwelling in us of which the *American Presbyterian* speaks.

A Joyful Church.

This is a sad and care-worn world, and one great reason why it is so, is that the right plan for enjoyment is not understood or followed. *Rejoicing*, in Scripture, is connected with *reviving*, and it is remarkable that in one well-known passage, the Hebrew connects the Divine *returning to make us alive again*, with rejoicing. The true sense of words is often preserved in their etymology. If we analyze the word *revival*, we will find that it means, *making alive again*.

Nature abhors death. Wherever there is life there is joy. Our unhappiness springs from the absence of life. Infants are spontaneously happy, their fulness of life is fulness of joy. We would not repress the impulsive happiness of youth, rather we would teach the possibility and the obligation of being happy. The joy of the Lord is your strength. Christians have no right to be dull and stupid. They have no right to extinguish all brightness and enjoyment in themselves, and then set up that dulness in themselves as the standard of excellence. This is not the teaching of Scripture.

We think it certain that men are not very generally happy. It may be said, that all persons cannot secure the animal spirits on which physical happiness so much depends. To which we reply, that while we are not opposing, we are not advocating animal happiness.

We think men miss enjoyment by not seeking for it in thy right way. Heaven is a place of happiness. "In thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand there are pleasures for ever more." God is the Fountain of Being, the infinite and glorious One, an illimitable ocean of sparkling joy. As light, wherever it strikes the waves, in the pale flush of morn, the brightness of noon, or the richness of evening, elicits beauty, so does every movement of the Infinite Ocean, from its centre to its endless outgoings, produce enjoyment. It is life, rejoicing in its own spontaneous outbursts.

But *we* have no essential life, and so no essential bliss. It follows that to enjoy, we must be connected with the source of joy. From the overflowing grace of God we must receive grace for grace. We must draw near

> The shadow from the Throne—
> The shadow without form, that meets
> The edges of the crystal sea—
> Awfuller than light derived,
> And red with all those primal heats
> Whereby all life hath lived.

The life of Christ is the life of the human soul. This is the central doctrine in theology. If any one asks how, we reply by asking him the nature of life. It is the mystery of mysteries. Look at family likenesses, national likenesses, and explain that mysterious conformity of being, by which the same traits of mind and heart, and the same features and form, re-appear after many generations; explain the difference between the Arab and the Anglo-Saxon, the wild Indian and the domestic negro. The life of the parent, the ancestor, passes into the children, and this is all we know.

So it is with the life of Christ. It is not alone that our opinions become the same as His, or our tastes or feelings. It is not alone that there is mutual affection. All these things may exist between friends in this world, but that is not the same thing as being *of the blood* of your father and your brother. Every one knows it is not. The closest relation that can be formed by those not of the same blood, is that between husband and wife, but even the murder of a wife by a husband, is not the fearful thing beyond words that the murder of a mother by her son would be. A gentleman told us that he once, when a boy, knew a German who struck his father a blow which felled him to the earth. Our informant told us that he always had a mysterious feeling about the man, that in some way, he would awfully expiate that sin. Many years passed away, the gentleman grew from a boy to middle life, when he heard that in the same town that German was murdered by his own son.

Men may say what they will of the language of Paul being figurative, but there never were such figures as he uses to express the life of Christ in the soul of the believer. We are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones. The apostle says it is a great mystery; the Saviour's life per-

vades our life; nay, we exchange lives. Our life is hid with Christ in God, and he is our life.

To be joyful then, we must feel the life of Christ quick in every vein. As it is with great nature in the Spring when the impulse of life comes, and the sap runs to every twig, and along the fine fibre of every blade of grass, and the power quickens every vein of the earth, and the world becomes a bright and joyous thing adorned as a bride for her husband; so is it with the felt presence of the Redeemer, the conscious life of Christ in the soul, the pressure of the everlasting arms, and the soft beam of the celestial eyes. We commit two great evils, we forsake the fountain of living water, and we hew out for ourselves broken cisterns that can hold no water. And then we complain of sorrow, and carking care, and of want of sympathy and help. It is because we are withering on the stalk, and have forgotten the power of the Living Vine.

There is no religion long where the doctrine of the immediate, direct influence of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, is given up. Any one who has really and earnestly striven to do good will find this to be true. This is the *dispensation* of the Spirit. All the efforts of science from the beginning of the world, have failed to put life into a dead insect. How then put life into a dead soul? And how can we *rejoice* with dead souls all around us?—very many in the open valley; and very dry? We cannot; the Church cannot be happy, unless the Spirit of God, the sweet and holy Dove, the powerful Heart of the Almighty pulsate through these dry bones, these fearful and ghastly skeletons. But when there is a shaking, and bone comes to his bone, and the sinews and the flesh come upon them, and the skin covers them, and the breath comes from the four winds and they *live*—an exceeding great army—the presence of life brings joy. Let us understand and settle it in our hearts, that we cannot be happy or even comfortable without the felt, conscious, living presence, of the Holy Spirit in our churches.

The fact is, that the virtue which keeps men even from open and disgusting wickedness, springs from the influence of religion, directly or indirectly. If the salt hath lost its savor, wherewith shall the world be salted? The Scriptures rely entirely upon the life of God, through the Church, for morality. They do not expect it elsewhere and we should not. Earth is but a province of God's empire. The magistrate is God's magistrate; the minister is God's minister. But if God withdraw himself, the earth will be precisely what a body is without a soul. Putrefaction will ensue, naked and disgusting depravity will pollute the very heavens with its foul reek. And where then is joy?

The forms of religion are of no value, except for the greater or less amount of spiritual life which they enshrine. See Saul; the Lord answered him not by prophets, nor by visions, nor by dreams, nor by Urim and Thummim. What is a church, if there be no God there. What is your house, when the beloved ones are gone? Very sad and lonesome, even when they are gone temporarily; and when they are gone forever, you can hardly bear the most familiar book, can hardly bear to look at the empty chair. Hophni and Phinehas took out the ark of God to save Israel, and the Philistines took it. It was an empty shrine. Every thing, it is true, has an appropriate expression, and so should a church have. It should be fit—however rude—in its grave decency, for the presence of the Eternal. "But is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" If the life of God pervade His house, then the place of His feet is glorious, and our faces shine and our hearts are transfigured. But otherwise religious worship is the most wearisome of all things. Dead form, God cannot away with, nor can a live man either. It is a smoke in his nostrils, an offence unto him.

God will give us any power, if we lean on His arm. See the living might in the arms of Moses, with Aaron and Hur on each side. The battle swayed to and fro as the arms of the great patriarch rose and fell in prayer. See Joshua with his spear outstretched to heaven. The infidel astronomer asks *how* the sun could stand still in heaven. How do we know? God started it and He can stop it if he chooses. We care not how. We wouldn't give a straw to know how. God gave Joshua power to stay the sun in his steep course. And Gideon's three hundred were greater than the three hundred of Leonidas, glorious as they were, for if Gideon's had been there, with Gideon's God, Xerxes and his millions would have recoiled backward and perished. If you doubt it, look at Sennacherib and his one hundred and eighty-five thousand. "This is the word which the Lord hath spoken concerning him; The Virgin, the daughter of Zion hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn."

When the spiritual power of God comes upon a place, the greatest blessing is given to it that is possible. It may not be always pleasant at first. Light in a dark cavern reveals foul reptiles; the eradicating of rank weeds, however necessary, is not agreeable. Conviction, repentance, sorrow for sin, mourning over past unfaithfulness,—these are the dark avenues to the bright light.

Then it is true, that there is something frightful about the deeper things of the soul; there are depths in man's nature that it is fearful to sound; else he were not great. The topics of religion are so mighty that, when realized, they disturb our equanimity. They even sometimes lead to enthusiasm and even fanaticism. No wonder. It is not so surprising that a man should be an enthusiast about religion, as that he should be stupid about it.

But who would set the small disturbance of his love of proportion over against so glorious blessings! Revivals of religion in the present condition of the world, are often revolutions. But the Reformation, and Revolutions of 1688 and 1776, were the very salvation of the world. That there may be quiet; that there may be enjoyment, the principles of liberty and right must be settled, even if it be "in battle and in storm." Better that the storm burst in wrath in mid heaven, that the air may be pure; the close and stifling atmos-

phere cannot be breathed, until Nature relieves herself by tears.

The presence of God is the glory of the Church, and *God's reviving is necessary to a rejoicing people.*

RESIGNATION OF THE KINGDOM.

BY GEORGE DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

We are called upon, in our inquiries respecting Messiah's kingdom, to consider whether it be a personal reign upon earth, in opposition to the spiritual millennarians; and also whether, according to the literal millennarians, that personal reign shall be limited to a thousand years, or whether it shall be for ever and ever.

St. Paul, when discoursing upon the resurrection, declares that men will rise in different bands, of which he mentions two, one past, the other yet future: "Christ the first fruits; afterwards, they that are Christ's at his coming; then the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father."

Now I apprehend that the whole of the millennarian question turns upon what kingdom this is which Messiah shall resign. Those who believe that Christ shall reign upon earth *for a thousand years*, understand this passage to speak of three distinct periods of the resurrection, dividing it in the following manner:—"Christ the first fruits, i. e. at the time of his resurrection; "afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming,"—this is the second period, between which and the former, there is, we know by experience, a space of upwards of eighteen hundred years; "then the end,"—this they understand to be a third period, which they also suppose will not be till a thousand years after the second advent, justifying their conjecture by the fact, that the "afterward" in the former clause has embraced a much longer period. Thus they defer the resignation of the kingdom here spoken of, until the end of the thousand years; and consequently conceive the ceded throne will be that of David, or that which I designate the *subordinate* throne.

Others agree with the millennarians in the first two divisions, but understand the surrender of the kingdom to be immediately connected with the coming, making the "then" a note of time in the following manner:—"Afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming; *then*, [i, e. next cometh,] "the end," implying that the next great event after the advent or the revelation of the Lord in the air, will be "the end." And they make the resignation of "the kingdom" to be at the period of the second advent. There being only that space of time between the revelation of the Lord and the resignation of the kingdom which will be occupied whilst the Lord, still in the glory of the Father, is bringing all his enemies unto subjection.

My first objection to the millennarian view is, that 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, will not bear the interpretation which that system requires. In order to sustain the millennarian interpretation, all the clauses should be homogeneous; there should be an identity of grammatical construction in the sentence, which therefore should run thus: "All shall be made alive, Christ [was made alive] as the first-fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's [shall be made alive] at his coming; then [*the rest of the dead*] [shall be made alive at] the end." Were this the form of the sentence, I admit there would be weight in the millennarian's argument, that "then" may denote the long interval of a thousand years which they derive from the xxth chapter of Revelation. But for this meaning there is no trace of authority in the text; on the contrary, this interpretation necessitates the introduction of new matter, quite foreign to the tenor of the apostle's discourse, which is confined to the resurrection of believers, and does not touch upon the resuscitation of the wicked,* he speaks of incorruptibility and immortality, privileges peculiar to the Lord's people; and when the mortal shall have put on immortality, by the translation of the saints, then shall be brought to pass the saying, "Death is swallowed up in victory:" the resurrection of the wicked has nothing to do with the victory over sin and death.

The assertion that, "the end" will be at the expiration of the millennium, is grounded upon the assumption that 1 Cor. xv. 24 synchronises with the latter part of the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypse; for neither from the epistle to the Corinthians, nor from any other passage in Scripture, except this in the Revelation, do we get any intimation of a certain state of things, continuing for a portion of time after Messiah's advent, which can justify such an application of the term "the end;" therefore the millennarians must go to the twentieth of the Apocalypse for the one thousand years which they assume will be the duration of Messiah's reign. But it is quite gratuitous to assume that the Corinthians could interpret St. Paul's meaning by the revelation of St. John: indeed, without entering into any dispute as to the date of the Apocalypse, we may say, at least, that the probability must be greatly in favor of the passage in Corinthians having a sense complete in itself; and certainly the burden of proof rests with those who maintain the contrary. We need not, however, remain satisfied with showing that there is but an assumption on the one side, and the probability in favor of the other; for by examination of the context we shall be able to come to a satisfactory conviction.

I have stated that the whole of the millennarian question turns upon what kingdom it is, which the Messiah will resign; this is true, because if we can decide which kingdom He will resign, we shall be able to determine what "end" is meant; that is, whether it be the end of this dispensation, or

* "But every man (*each*, that is, Christ, and they that are Christ's,) in his own order," 1 Cor. xv. 20. *Vaughan, Church's Expectation*, p. 83. Mr. Brown makes this just remark: "But each in his own order,"—that is, of course, each of the two parties just mentioned,—"Christ," and "all who in Christ shall be made alive: the first fruits and the subsequent harvest." Page 326.

the end of the thousand years; because the end of the co-ordinate reign must be at the end of this dispenstion, for we have already seen that during this age Messiah is sitting and reigning co-ordinately upon the Father's throne, where He will remain until his enemies shall be under his feet. But if the subordinate kingdom is to be surrendered, then the time of its resignation may be at the end of the thousand years. Thus we shall determine whether the "then" denotes a *point* or an *interval* of time, which is the real difference between the two interpretations of 1 Cor. xv. 24.

The reign to be surrendered is that during which Christ's enemies are not under his feet; "for He must reign *until* He hath put all enemies under his feet." I do not hesitate to say that the apostle refers to Psalm cx. "Sit thou at my right hand *until* I make thine enemies thy footstool;" for I have already shown, in the preceding chapter, that sitting at God's right hand, is sitting on the throne of God, and is equivalent to reigning. If, then, the reign to be surrendered is that which Messiah is exercising whilst his enemies are in opposition to Him, it cannot be the millennial reign, and the "end" to which the appostle refers is therefore the end of this dispensation, when the last of Christ's enemies shall have been put in subjection.

The object for which Christ holds the power which is to be resigned, is in order to abolish all rule, and authority, and power, that God's decreed subjection of all things under the Son of man may be accomplished. "Then the end . . . when He shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power; for He must reign until He hath put all enemies under his feet . . . for He hath put all things under his feet;" which I should paraphrase thus: "for Christ must reign, sharing the supreme dominion with the Father, until with that supreme power and authority Christ shall have subjected all his enemies; for He (the Father hath decretively in Psalm viii.) put all things under his feet." This corresponds with the force of the Hebrew in Psalm cx. "Sit thou at my right hand, until I *cause to place* thine enemies thy footstool."

Now it appears clear, that the authority which is exercised in bringing *all power*, and even death itself, into subjection to Christ, cannot be the power of David's son as such, but must be the arm of Omnipotence; the throne, then, that is to be surrendered, is not that of David, but the co-ordinate reign.

The apostle, in 1 Cor. xv. 27, evidently refers to Psalm viii., for the expression, "When he saith all things are put under him," manifestly shows that he alludes to some passage of Scripture, and that passage is in the viiith Psalm. If now we turn to the inspired comment in Heb. ii., we learn that Jesus is now "crowned with glory and honor," "but now we see not yet all things put under him,"—implying that Jesus is now reigning, but that all things are not yet in subjection; and clearly Psalm viii., which speaks of all things having been brought into subjection, relates to the dominion of the Son of man in the world to come; all things being in subjection is the characteristic feature of the reign of the Son of man, the bringing of all into subjection is the work of this present dispensation.

The principal characteristic of this kingdom is, that whilst the Son holds it, he is not subject, or subordinate to the Father, for he becomes subordinate upon resigning it. "When all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto Him that put all things under him." Christ, therefore, is not subject to the Father until all things are subjected unto Him, and Christ will become subject, when all things are subjected; but Christ resigns the kingdom when He shall have put down all rule, &c. It seems, therefore, to follow of necessity, that Messiah's resignation of the kingdom, and his becoming subject, are contemporaneous; indeed, that he becomes subject by the resignation of the kingdom. But we have seen that the co-ordinate reign of Christ, namely, that in which He is not subject to the Father, is during this present dispensation, when "He sits on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens," or whilst He sits upon his Father's throne; hence the throne to be resigned must be that of God the Father; and "the end" must be the end of this dispensation.

The reason why the kingdom is to be resigned, "that God may be all in all," manifestly shows the nature of the reign.

The expression, "that God may be all in all," implies that God will then exercise all rule, and authority, and power. This will be upon the sounding of the seventh trumpet, when God takes to himself his great power and reigns. In order to this, it would be necessary for Christ to surrender the co-ordinate throne, and it would not be necessary for Him to surrender the subordinate throne; for it is clear, that when God's anointed king sits upon the throne of David—upon the throne of a creature—upon that throne which He will share with all who overcome—He will not interfere with God being "all in all." Creature rule cannot interfere with divine authority, unless the creature be in a state of rebellion; but that cannot be said of Christ.

Whilst there is sin in the world, whilst there are enemies in opposition to Christ, God cannot be "all in all." At present there is rebellion against God's authority, therefore all things are upheld by the word of Christ's power, and therefore Christ is said to be "all in all;" for whilst there is sin in the world, the world must be in the hands of a mediator, otherwise essential holiness would blaze forth in its necessary opposition to moral evil; hence absolute Deity will not become the head of sustentation or of rule, until the creature is brought into a state of absolute holiness, or at least is restrained from any overt acts of sin. The kingdom, therefore, will be resigned by the Mediator, at the end of this dispensation.

We have, moreover, an exact note of time to guide us. Christ sits at God's right hand until his enemies are made his footstool; but when all shall have been subjected unto Him, then shall the Son himself be subject: but how will He become subject, but by resigning that throne on which He is not subject? He therefore sits at God's right hand *until* he resigns the kingdom; "the

end," therefore, to which the apostle refers, must be when Christ leaves the right hand of God.

Christ is to reign *until* He hath put all enemies under his feet, but He is to sit at God's right hand *until* his enemies are made his footstool; therefore the subjection of his enemies equally marks the termination of his reign and session at God's right hand; "the end," therefore, when He surrenders the kingdom, must be the end of this dispensation, when He leaves the right hand of the Father.

Another note of time is, that death is the last enemy which shall be subjected before resigning the kingdom. The subjection of death, *inasmuch* as it is an enemy of Christ, will be immediately upon, or I should rather say *by*, the mutation of the living saints; death will be swallowed up in victory, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, when the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and when "we" (i. e. the living saints) "shall be changed;" for this same corruptible (i. e. the dead saints) must put on incorruptibility, and this same mortal (i. e. the living saints) must put on immortality; but *when* this corruptible shall have put on incorruptibility, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory." The "when" and the "then" are clearly marks of time. But we also learn that *when* death shall be swallowed up in victory, that *then* shall Messiah resign the kingdom; for He must resign *until* He shall have put all his enemies under his feet, the last enemy that shall be abolished is death; so Christ will surrender the kingdom at the moment of the resurrection of the dead saints, and mutation of the living ones. If, therefore, "the end," when He surrenders the kingdom, be not till the end of the thousand years, the resurrection of the dead saints, and mutation of the living ones, will not be until the end of the thousand years. This view, therefore, is utterly destructive of the hopes of those who look for the resurrection of the saints at the beginning of the thousand years; it is equally destructive of the expectations of Christ's personal reign upon earth for a thousand years.

Shortly then to recapitulate. "The end" is when Christ shall resign the kingdom in which He is co-ordinate; exercising his divine power to subjugate all his enemies; the close of which will be coincident with the resurrection of the dead saints; and which He surrenders in order that God the Father may be "all in all."

THE FATHER'S ASSUMPTION OF POWER.

The examination of 1 Cor. xv. has led to the conclusion that Messiah will resign the co-ordinate throne to the Father, and leave the right hand of God, at the conclusion of this dispensation, at which time the dead saints will be raised, and the living changed. I shall confirm this view by showing from other passages that at the period of the second advent, and not at the close of the millennium, the Father will take to himself his great power and reign.

In that prayer which our Lord taught his followers, and which we so often have on our lips, we express the desire to our Father that *his* kingdom may come; it would be strange were we commanded to pray for that which cannot come to pass until a thousand years after this dispensation has ceased, as those who maintain that Christ will surrender the kingdom to the Father at the end of the thousand years must suppose. Surely we are not to be expecting one thing, and praying for another; Christ's kingdom is that for which we are to pray. Are we not therefore, to expect the manifestation of God's kingdom upon the appearance of Messiah? What makes it more striking is, that all look for the following clause in the Lord's Prayer to be fulfilled when Messiah shall return. But if we expect the fulfilment of the clause, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," upon the return of our Lord, surely we are equally bound to expect the fulfilment of the preceding clause, at the same time, and not a thousand years after. The glorified spirits in heaven (Rev. v. 10.) are looking forward to their reign upon earth; are we taught to overlook that which they desire, and to pray for that which cannot come to pass until another dispensation of a thousand years has transpired? No: when the glorified spirits shall reign with Christ upon earth, then will God's kingdom be come, as a comparison of passages will show.

By comparing Matt. xvi. 28 with Mark ix. 1, and Luke ix. 27, we learn that "the Son of man coming in *his kingdom*," is the same as "the *kingdom of God*" coming with power.

Our Lord, when instituting the supper, says to his disciples, "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom;" the expression is varied by St. Luke to "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the *kingdom of God* shall come." But St. Paul, referring to the ordinance, and marking the period of limitation for its observance, says, "Ye do shew the Lord's death till *He* come." It is therefore evident that when the Lord Jesus shall come, that then the kingdom of God the Father shall come.

From the comparison of these texts we see that the Kingdom of God, is the kingdom of Christ's Father; from other passages we also learn that the establishing of the kingdom of God, that is, of God the Father, will be at the return of Messiah.

We are told in Luke xix. 11, that the Lord spake a parable, because the people "thought that the kingdom of God would immediately appear;" they were expecting the kingdom of Messiah, and they did not look for some kingdom which will not be established until a thousand years after the return of Messiah. And certainly the tenor of our Lord's parable would lead us to infer that when He shall return, having received the kingdom, that then the kingdom of God will appear.

When the Pharisees demanded when the kingdom of God should come, they expected the kingdom of Messiah, that kingdom which the God of heaven will set up; but our Lord implies, in what He says to his disciples, that it is the same as "the days of the Son of man."

So when the Son of man shall come "with power and great glory," then "the kingdom of God" shall come.

By comparing the fifth and seventh verses of 2 Thess. i., we gather that the entrance into the kingdom of God will be at the revelation of Jesus Christ. The Thessalonians were counted worthy of the *kingdom of God*, for which they also suffered, and they are to be recompensed *when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed;* the recompense is the rest which they will enjoy in the kingdom of God, and into this they will enter when the Lord Jesus shall return.

Our Lord promises that at the end of this age, when the Son of man shall send forth his angels to gather out of *his kingdom* all things that offend, that "then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in *the kingdon of their Father*." So, upon the casting out of Satan, it is said, "Now is come the *kingdom of our God* and the power of his Christ." Now all these passages are in accordance with the fact, that "the kingdom of Christ and of God" are not in succession, one established a thousand years after the other, but that when the Christ, or Anointed, reigns in his own, that is, on the subordinate throne, that then the kingdom of God the Father is come.

If now the Father takes to himself his great power, and commences to reign, at the same time that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of the Messiah, it is clear that Messiah will not have that great power to surrender at the end of the thousand years. It is also clear that if the Father takes that great power at the commencement of the thousand years, He had not taken it before that time, but to whom else could it have been entrusted until that time but to the Messiah? "The end" therefore to which the apostle must refer, is the end of this dispensation.

From Henry Grew.

Dear Bro. Storrs.—If our dear brother WENDELL will quote any remarks of mine "misrepresenting (his) position," I will follow his commendable example in another case, and "withdraw them." I hardly need say to *him*, that if I have done so, it was unintentional.

I pray, dear brother, that the great Captain of our salvation may uphold you in your arduous warfare. I sympathize with you from experience in the treatment you receive from men of perverse minds. Let us remember our dear Master, what contradiction against himself he endured for our sake! O for more of his spirit of holy fortitude and patience. Soon the conflict will end and the everlasting victory be achieved. One smile of welcome to the joy of our Lord will amply compensate for all we are called to endure for his dear namesake. As David, who sometimes thought he should surely fall by the hand of his enemy, "*strengthened himself in his God*," so may my brother STORRS.

You understand that although the Devil "is a usurper in relation to God—it (I say *he*) reigns by right in relation to man." Yet you say, God "did not give man the right to transfer that dominion (over the creatures) to another power." Now if man has no right to confer this right, the Devil cannot receive it *as a right from him.* The devil therefore is a "usurper" both as it respects God and man, though, for wise ends, it is permitted by Him "who worketh all things after to the counsel of his own will."

On your remark concerning angels, permit me to ask—"Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to ministers for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Heb. 1 : 14. It is true indeed that we may err respecting "*their* intercourse with man," as we may on other scriptural subjects.—Commending you and yours to our Redeemer's all-sufficient grace, I am as ever yours in christian love, HENRY GREW.

Phila., Nov. 11th, 1856.

N. B. Two dollars enclosed for next year's subscription.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive?

BR. STORRS:—The subjoined article from the pen of Bro. Grew I have copied from the *Advent Harbinger* of Feb. 7th, 1852, and sent it to you for insertion in the EXAMINER. Just at this time, when our brother has so earnestly endeavored to sustain the doctrine of a temporary future *life* of *torment* for the wicked dead, it will be equally gratifying and instructing to many to see how admirably Bro. Grew of 1852, can answer the arguments of Bro. Grew of 1856, by simply planting himself upon the Bible truth that—"The wages of sin is DEATH," and affirming, as he does, that—"*Life*, in a miserable state, is *no more* DEATH than life in a happy state." To this I say, *Amen*, and reiterate the admonition of our dear brother—"Let no man presume to diminish *or add* to the word of the Lord." To our truth-seeking brethren I would say, give Bro. G.'s artiele a careful consideration, and of the latter I would humble beg to be informed how he reconciles his *Harbinger* article with his more recent utterances in relation to "the penalty of the law." When he clears up this matter, I would be glad to invite his attention to other considerations bearing upon the question, "Will the wicked dead be made *alive?*" Yours, hoping for life eternal through God's dear Son. RUFUS WENDELL.

Canajoharie, N. Y., Nov. 6, 1856.

THE PENALTY OF THE LAW.

By HENRY GREW IN 1852.

A law is a requisition, or enactment, enforced by penal sanction. This distinguishes it from mere advice.

Man is an intelligent, moral, and accountable being. He is subject to law, the law of his Creator, which is the law of righteousness, and the law of love.

No law can be violated with impunity, whether natural or moral. 'The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork,' because each heavenly body keeps its proper orbit. All move in perfect harmony. Not one can leave its true orbit without disastrous result.

So the physical laws of the human body cannot be disregarded without injurious consequence.—Food, drink, raiment of suitable quality and quantity are essential to health. How dearly does the intemperate man pay for indulging his appetite with the poison of alcohol! No less extensive are the evil effects of excessive and improper eating.—How many have been hurried to a premature grave by adhering to a fashionable and injurious mode of dress!

Our present inquiry, however, has special reference to the penalty which the Judge of all the earth has affixed to the transgression of his law of righteousness and love. Various and diverse are the opinions of fallible and erring men relative to this important subject.

It has been supposed by some that this penalty consists only in the mental and physical evils of the present state, to be terminated by a temporary death; and that the whole human race are destined to eternal life and happiness. They hold, that it is not compatible with infinite goodness, either to sustain any intelligent and moral being in eternal misery, or to destroy him forever.

Others maintain that the penalty of the law consists in all the miseries of the present life, followed by temporary death, which will be succeeded by eternal life in mental and physical agonies, severe and terrible as the Almighty can inflict, and the creature, with ever increasing capacity, can endure.

'What saith the scriptures' of eternal truth?—When the ever blessed God created man, and gave him commandment, with what did he threaten him in case of disobedience? 'In the day thou eatest thereof *dying* thou shalt DIE.' Did the Almighty add to this, subsequent eternal life in torment?—Not a word to indicate any such thing. Let us read again: 'The soul that sinneth IT SHALL DIE.' Again, 'the wages of sin is DEATH, but the gift of God, is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord!' This passage is very instructive.

'The wages of sin is DEATH.' 'Death is the cessation of life. It is the opposite of life in all its states and conditions. Life, in a miserable state, is no more death than life in a happy state.

'*Wages*' is that which is justly due for work.—The proposition that 'the *wages* of sin is death,' is equivalent to the proposition that the *just desert* of sin is death. This declaration of divine truth determines what is the just desert of transgression. Let no man presume to diminish or add to the word of the Lord.

Now if the wages, or just desert of sin, is death, it follows that any punishment, which vastly exceeds this, is *unjust*. If the punishment of eternal existence in agonizing torments is not more than what sin justly deserves, it follows, unavoidably, that death, which will terminate all consciousness, is not the just desert of sin. It falls infinitely short of what justice demands, and the divine testimony consequently falls. 'Let God be true and every man a liar,' that opposes his testimony.

Now let us considerthe connected testimony.—'The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.' Observe the contrast. It is not eternal in different conditions, as self-styled orthodoxy represents the future states of the two characters of men to be. It is LIFE and DEATH. Other scriptures harmonize with this great truth. 'He that hath the Son HATH LIFE, he that hath not the Son shall not see LIFE.' The declaration is no where to be found in the inspired volume that the finally impenitent are to lose *happy* life, or shall not see happy life. The terms used in reference to this awful subject throughout the Bible all harmonize. 'Destruction,' 'perdition,' 'perish,' 'consumed,' 'devoured,' 'burned up,' come to an 'end,' &c., accord perfectly with the literal import of the term death, which is plainly declared to be the penalty of the law.

The scripture doctrine of Immortality confirms the same. Is there a single declaration that all men are immortal or ever will be? Not one. An immortal being can never die. 'Mortal man,' is the language of scripture; Job. 4: 17. Immortality is not an attribute of human nature. It is the gift of God through Jesus Christ, and an object to be sought for by faith in the record that God has given of his Son, and by patient continuance in well doing. Rom. 2: 7. 'This is the record, that God has given us eternal life, and this life is IN HIS SON.' No eternal life in, or from the first Adam, who was of 'the earth, earthy.' It is in the second Adam, who is 'the Lord from Heaven.'

The proposition that 'the wages of sin is death,' plainly imports and teaches, that the cessation of the sinner's life or conscious existence, is a punishment perfectly satisfactory to divine justice and adequately honors the violated law of God. It follows, therefore, that the horrible dogma of eternal existence in agonizing torments is a libel on 'the *just* God,' as it is on 'the Father of *mercies*.'

H. GREW.

A SYLLOGISM.

BY THE EDITOR.

"If the wages, or just desert of sin, is death, it follows that any punishment which vastly exceeds this is *unjust*."—*H. Grew*, in 1852.

A revival into life, from death, to torment awhile and kill again "vastly exceeds death:"

Therefore such revival, torment and killing again "is *unjust*."

ADDENDA.

"If the punishment of" a temporary life from the dead, to be spent "in agonizing torments," and followed by dying a second time, "is not more than what sin justly deserves, it follows, unavoidably, that *death*, which will terminate all consciousness, is not the just desert of sin: it falls short of what justice demands, and the divine testimony consequently falls." "'Let God be true and every

man a liar,' that opposes his testimony."—See H. Grew's article on "the Penalty of the Law."

"The proposition that 'the wages of sin is *death*,' plainly imports and teaches, that the cessation of the sinner's life, or conscious existence, is a punishment *perfectly* satisfactory to divine justice, and adequately honors the violated law of God. It follows, therefore, that the horrible dogma of a revival of them, when dead, to life, or into a conscious existence in agonizing torments is a libel on the 'just God,' as it is on 'the Father of mercies.'" See H. Grew's article, as aforesaid.

We have seen, for a long time, that the view we maintain of "*No life out of Christ*," and "*The wages of sin is death*," must lead to a plain and open confession, ultimately, that the wicked dead will never live again. *Death* is their fate: not *dying*, whether once or twice, nor any torments that may precede that dying, but to be dead, to live no more—death to have unbroken, *dominion* over them. Such dominion it had not over Christ, and it shall not have over any member of his body, the true believers in him; all others are "holden with the cords of their sins" under death's dominion, eternally irrevocable.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, December 1, 1851.

European Affairs.—For years our eyes have been turned to Europe and Asia as the field of prophecy, or the countries where the scenes of prophecy are mainly laid. In our mind there is no doubt but that all the symbolical representations of governments, or dynasties, civil and ecclesiastical, in the Scriptures, are set forth in that field; and that none of them pertain to this country.—The prophecy which speaks of "strong nations afar off" being *rebuked*, we think, does include this country, and will before long be realized.—But the symbolizing "beasts," of all sorts, we are confident pertain to the eastern hemisphere of our globe, and mainly to the old Roman Empire; and that it is there we are to look for the fulfillment of all such prophecies. On the particular application of these prophecies, so far as yet unfulfilled, we think quite too much speculation has been indulged by nearly all writers on the subject; and so much that has proved to be erroneous has been promulgated, and insisted on as undoubted truth, that an influence has gone abroad against all attempts to understand prophecy at all. If men were content to express an opinion of what is probably true on the subject of unfulfilled prophecy without insisting on implicit credit being given to their theories—as many do—we think good might still be done in the examination. But we seem to be doomed to have a class of expositors, in this generation, who think a positive spirit is commendable in this matter. With such expositors *we* have no sympathy; and we are satisfied they are preparing the way more and more for a contempt of prophecy altogether, even by those who have heretofore been disposed to follow them.

Our thoughts have been much turned towards the *Napoleon* Dynasty; but we have endeavored to avoid a positive spirit relative to its mission and destiny. From recent accounts from Europe we have been led to think the present Napoleon has nearly run his race. Whether he is to be succeeded by another of the same family, or what will be the result of his death or downfall we cannot at present see. If that Dynasty is symbolized by the "scarlet beast" of Rev. 17th, then it seems likely the Papal Roman Power will fall with Napoleon, or very soon after. But what the order of events, in the matter, is, we cannot pretend to say, and therefore we wait for the development; and we thus wait with as much interest as those who manifest the positive spirit of which we have spoken; yet we think with far less anxiety as to the course of events. God's purposes will stand and He will do all His pleasure, however we mortals may err in our judgment of what is at hand.

On the present state of Europe and its affairs we give our readers an extract from the "English Correspondent" of the *Christian Advocate* of this city. The writer seems to us to take a correct view of the subject. He speaks as follows:—

—

Except in time of actual warfare, European politics have not for a long period presented so gloomy and troubled aspects as at present. Diplomatic relations between the Western Powers and Naples have at last been effectually broken off by the departure of the embassies of Great Britain and France from the territory of the Two Sicilies; but in the presence of what may prove vastly graver matters, the Italian question does not excite anything like the interest it did a month or even a fortnight ago. The peace of Europe is menaced, and the danger draws hourly nearer, from the incurable disease under which I formerly told you I had ascertained from trustworthy authority, altogether apart from newspaper rumors, Louis Napoleon is suffering. His throne, too, is already shaken by

the financial difficulties which surround him. Sedition permeates all classes of society in Paris.—Plots for the overthrow of the government, and conspiracies against the life of the emperor, are formed in every *cafe*, and, worst sign of all, the police are said to be unusually lax in their efforts to detect the conspirators, influenced by a conviction that the *regime* under which they serve at present is not destined in any case to a protracted existence. Thus assailed by thickening and darkening dangers without, and feeling within the grasp of death steadily and relentlessly contracting on his vitals, it is not wonderful if what muttered whispers now declare be true, that his once clear and powerful intellect has already shown such symptoms of aberration and decay as to create the gravest doubts, even among those most attached to his throne of his fitness to continue to direct the destines of France. Certain it is, that the licentious orgies which it was hoped had been terminated for ever by his marriage, have been resumed, perhaps in that spirit of desperate jollity assumed by men who wish to "die game;" perhaps in the wild hope of really prolonging life by banishing gloomy thoughts and evading their depressing influence. It is certain, however, that even in the course of nature the throne of France will shortly become vacant, and it is by no means improbable, that within the lapse of a few days or hours a single pistol-shot may at once create the vacancy and ring the knell of half the dynasties of Europe.

But existing political complications threaten the most serious consequences, even though the reign of Louis Napoleon should be protracted far beyond the present time. The six months assigned for the fulfillment of the condition of the recent treaty of peace have just terminated. The conditions have not been fulfilled, and France exhibits decided tendencies toward the formation of an alliance with Russia, and the termination of the existing one with England. Russia has broken the compact by her retention of the Isle of Serpents, and her omission to withdraw her Bessarabian frontier from the Danube. England has not complied with the condition which required her to withdraw her fleet from the Black Sea, and permit the closing of the Dardanelles, but alleges that her non-compliance is the necessary consequence of the breach of faith by Russia in the instance just specified.—And Austria, who was bound to evacuate the Principalities, retains undisturbed military occupation of them, alleging the conduct of Great Britain and Russia in justification of her own violation of the treaty when reproached for it by France. Under these circumstances, Great Britain is understood to approve of the Austrian policy, and to find fault with that of France, on the ground that a more resolute determination on the part of the latter to act with Great Britain in compelling the compliance of Russia with the letter of the treaty, would long since have secured that object, and would thereby have obviated the necessity of the continued presence of a British fleet in the Black Sea, and an Austrian army in the Principalities. Whatever be the personal feelings of the French emperor, it is certain that many of the men most in his confidence are the friends of Russia and the enemies of England, and the most powerful efforts are being made to detach him from the British alliance and lead him to substitute for it the friendship of the czar. Austria deems the occasion opportune to cement a closer union with Great Britain, and is believed to have already made most important proposals to our cabinet to that effect.

DESIRING TO BE GIVEN UP TO GOD.

BY REV. A. M. TOPLADY.

O that my heart were right with Thee,
And loved Thee with a perfect love!
O that my Lord would dwell in me,
And never from his seat remove!
Jesus, remove th' impending load,
And set my soul on fire for God!

Thou seest I dwell in awful night,
Until thou in my heart appear;
Kindle the flame, O Lord, and light
Thine everlasting candle there:
Thy presence puts the shadows by;
If thou art gone, how dark am I!

Ah! Lord, how should thy servant see,
Unless thou give me seeing eyes?
Well may I fall, if out of thee;
If out of thee how should I rise?
I wander, Lord, without thy aid,
And lose my way in midnight shade.

Thy bright, unerring light afford,
A light that gives the sinner hope;
And from the house of bondage, Lord,
O bring the weary captive up;
Thine hand alone can set me free,
And reach my pardon out to me.

O let my prayer acceptance find,
And bring the mighty blessing down;
And eye-salve, Lord, anoint the blind,
And seal me thine adopted son;
A fallen, helpless creature take,
An heir of thy salvation make.

A PURIFYING HOPE.

By the Editor.

"Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." 1 John 3 : 2, 3.

As we have often dwelt on the nature of hope, we shall say no more on that topic than simply to remark, it is made up of desire and expectation; that neither of these alone form hope; nor can expectation rationally exist without a good reason, which must arise from a reliable promise, or an exertion that forms a just ground for hope. That which depends upon the act of another must have a reliable promise to make the object one of expectation; or if it depends in whole or part on our personal exertion, that exertion must be put forth, or there is no ground for rational expectation; hence their cannot be a well grounded hope.

With these preliminary remarks we proceed to notice

I. The Hope of the text: "*This hope.*" It has several peculiarities—

1. *It is the hope of "sons of God."* "Now are we the sons of God." It is not therefore a hope common to all men, for all men are not in such relation to God. All sustain the relation of creatures to God as their Creator; but the relation of sons is essentially another matter. It pertains to a moral development, and in that view many men are of their "father the devil;" so hath Jesus testified. That development which establishes the relation of sons to God arises only by, and in virtue of, a union with the Son of God, whereby we become "partakers of the Divine nature;" or receive of the Holy Spirit of God, which is shed on those who believe on the name of Jesus, and by which they are "sealed," and "which is the earnest of" their "inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." See Eph. 1 : 13, 14. 2 Peter 1 : 2–4. 2 Corth. 1 : 21, 22.

2. "This hope" is a hope of "*seeing*" *Jesus Christ;* that is, of seeing him personally, or in his proper personality. This sight is not, as some fancy, a spiritual or mere mental sight, but an actual vision of Jesus Christ. As to a spiritual manifestation of Christ, no man can be a son of God without it, but having this, he hopes to see Jesus personally; and that hope is based on many promises. Without the spiritual manifestation, love to Christ does not arise; and yet such manifestation and love is only the prelude to the personal sight of our Lord. "Whom having not seen ye love," saith Peter; they had not yet the personal sight of Jesus, but Peter saith, "that your faith might be found unto praise and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ"—literally, "at the *unveiling* of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. 1 : 7, 8.

How different is "this, hope" from that of those who think of no other sight of Jesus than a spiritual one? or from the hope of such as talk of seeing him at death? or when they die; for

3. "This hope" is that "we shall see him *as he is;*" not as *he was* in the days of humiliation; but in his triumphant glory; when he "shall sit" upon "the throne of his glory." Matt. 19 : 28, 29.—That throne of his glory is "the throne of his father David," which God hath promised him with an oath. See Lk. 1 : 32, 33. Acts 2 : 30. "This hope," therefore, embraces what is called the "*second* advent" of our Lord Jesus Christ. Thus Paul speaks to Titus, chapter 2, "Looking for that blessed hope, and the manifestation of the glory of the great God, and our Life-giver, Jesus Messiah." (*Syriac.*)

"This hope," is, also, the hope of being made "*like him.*" To "be glorified together" with him: to "put on immortality—incorruptibility"—to be placed in a state where "neither can they die any more"—"death shall have no more dominion over" them, as it has not "over him"—partners in his throne—"I will give to sit with me in my throne," saith Jesus: yea, they "shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." See Rom. 8 : 17. 1 Corth. 15 : 54. Luke 20 : 36. Rom. 6 : 9. Rev. 3 : 21. Matt. 13 : 43.

Truly, "it doth not yet appear what we shall be," but it is none the less true, that when Jesus shall appear we shall be like him. The world "knew him not" when he was here, as it now knows not his followers. Little does the world think—when it is setting at naught the meek and humble followers of Christ, that it is thus treating those who are hereafter to rule the world as joint heirs with Christ when he shall appear.

II. How is "this hope" distinguished from that of those who are not the "sons of God?" *Answer*: *By its effects.* "Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself," &c. But by what rule is this done? *Ans.* The rule is Christ—"*Even as he is pure.*"

Here we will examine the rule in some particulars. Christ was—

1. Pure from seeking "*honor of men.*" Thus—"I receive not honor from men. How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" John 5 : 41, 44. One of th
human nature is this d
by our fellow creatu
thousands to travel th
shuts them up in the
stantly comes home to
this disposition is per
can advance, to profit
pure from such desire
and it is of the first im
In saying Jesus wa
the disposition spoken
pride. Some persons
necessary exercise, an
not maintain self-resp
talk shows ignorance,
cate. Pride is sin.
maintain self-respect
and did he not alway
priety in his intercour
he came in contact?
sary for any purpose,
a sinner, or that he w
qualities for good soc
destroying sin; and i
and takes a thousand
ferent circumstances o
the pulpit; it takes it
in the flowing robes,
tire; it goes to social
pray; it talks against
goes with the rich, an
On what side soever
openly or crawls secr
be very innocent and
ful. It shows itself i
and it affirms, men ar
with attributes which
hated by all in others
a household God for
men misers, and othe
"churches," or temple
fatherless of food and
and is hated: it blind
the rich and the poor,
the peace and repose
yet it is the last thin
with. There is one
pride never appeared,
lowly" Jesus. He wa
2. He was pure fr
"Though he was rich,
poor;" and he said, "N
"Ye cannot serve God

5 : 41, 44. One of the strongest propensities of human nature is this desire to be thought well of by our fellow creatures. This disposition leads thousands to travel the broad road to death, and shuts them up in the rejection of truth that constantly comes home to their understanding. While this disposition is permitted to hold sway no man can advance, to profit, in divine things. Jesus was pure from such desire, or free from its control; and it is of the first importance that we should be.

In saying Jesus was free from the control of the disposition spoken of, we say, he was pure from *pride*. Some persons have advocated pride as a necessary exercise, and that without it men would not maintain self-respect, or "be decent." Such talk shows ignorance, pride, or folly, in the advocate. Pride is sin. Did Jesus sin? Did he not maintain self-respect? Was he not "decent?" and did he not always conduct himself with propriety in his intercourse with all classes with whom he came in contact? To say that pride is necessary for any purpose, is to affirm that Jesus was a sinner, or that he was defective in the necessary qualities for good society! The fact is, pride is a destroying sin; and it destroys in a thousand ways, and takes a thousand forms, according to the different circumstances of persons in life. It ascends the pulpit; it takes its place in the pews; it walks in the flowing robes, and hides in the meanest attire; it goes to social prayer; and it refuses to pray; it talks against sin, and persists in sin; it goes with the rich, and it travels with the poor. On what side soever we turn, this monster appears openly or crawls secretly; and it always claims to be very innocent and harmless; yea absolutely useful. It shows itself in the desire to "be as Gods;" and it affirms, men are Gods; for it clothes them with attributes which belong to God alone. It is hated by all in others, but is carressed and made a household God for themselves. It makes some men misers, and others spendthrifts; it adorns the "churches," or temples, and strips the widows and fatherless of food and clothing to do it: it hates and is hated: it blinds and is blinded: it destroys the rich and the poor, and is a foul murderer of the peace and repose of all where it dwells; and yet it is the last thing any are willing to part with. There is one example, however, where pride never appeared, *viz.* Jesus—the "*meek and lowly*" Jesus. He was pure from pride. Again,

2. He was pure from the "*love of mammon*." "Though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor;" and he said, "No man can serve two masters" "Ye cannot serve God and mammon:" and he also said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." See 2 Corth. 8 : 9. Matt. 6 : 24. Acts 20 : 35.

3. He was pure from *a spirit of selfishness:* or, his labor was not for himself alone. He "went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil:" Acts 10 : 38. His was an earnest desire and effort to benefit the children of men; and the most needy and oppressed were sure to share in his benevolence.

4. He was pure from a *murmuring spirit.*—None ever had more occasion to be dissatisfied with his present lot: none were ever in greater straits or trials; yet no murmur ever escaped him. "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth" to complain. "he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth"—no complaining is ever heard. What submission to his lot, and to his Father's will!

5. His *love to men was pure:*—it was not a hypocritical pretence. His love not only led him to poverty, reproach, and amazing sufferings for men, but to "taste death for every man;" "while we were sinners Christ died for the ungodly."—Here is no mock love, or love rising no higher than *profession:* it stands out in living characters, and may be read of all men. He gave practical proof of its reality.

6. His love to God, his Father, was pure. "I delight to do Thy will," he could say: and again, "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." Such was the love of Christ to God. How unlike some professed worshipers of God, who declare, if it was not for the dread of endless torture they would not serve God at all. If such speak the truth of themselves, they have no love to God, and are mere hypocrites in all their professions of love. They do not at all resemble Christ in his pure love to his Father.

7. Jesus was pure in all his *tempers, words and actions.* So far was he above fault, in these particulars, that he could appeal to his worst enemies, and say—"Which of you convicteth me of sin;" John 8 : 46. (*Syriac.*)

Such was the purity of him whom we are called to imitate—whose example we are called to follow. "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk even as he walked." 1 John 2 : 6.

"This hope," then, of seeing Jesus as he is and being like him, leads "*every man*," that hath it, to purify himself after this sample of purity. Thus are the "sons of God" to know themselves, and to

be known of others; for, "EVERY MAN that hath this hope" thus purifieth himself—by this rule. But—

III. HOW IS THIS PURIFICATION ACCOMPLISHED? It is said "He purifieth himself." A man may be said to do that which he is anxious to accomplish, and uses every possible means to effect.—Thus, Paul said, he once "compelled" christians "to blaspheme." He was anxious to have them do so, and did all he could to that end. So "he purifieth *himself*" indicates the will set on the object, and all the means in one's power employed to accomplish the end.

1. *Faith* is the medium through which this purity is accomplished. If there is no faith in its attainment, how can it be had? It will not rain down from heaven upon us. "Blessed are they that hunger and thrist after righteousness, for THEY SHALL BE FILLED." And, "He that cometh to God must believe that *He is*, and that He is THE REWARDER of them that diligently seek Him."—Matt. 5:6. Heb. 11:6. And James saith. "Let him ask in faith nothing wavering." Faith, or a sincere belief, that what God has commanded us to be He will enable us to be, if we seek His help without doubting His faithfulness, is a most important exercise of mind. Let us then dwell upon God's faithfulness to His promises, and believe that what He has enjoined on us to attain He will certainly enable us to reach, and we shall find the purity spoken of in our text not that impossible object of attainment our unbelief has so often suggested. Thus coming to God for the aid of His Spirit, we shall find that "what He has promised he is able to perform:" and He has promised, "I will circumcise thine heart that thou mayest love the Lord thy God will all thine heart;" thus circumcised in heart we shall be pure even as Christ is pure. Let none then sink down in sullen unbelief: the prize is too great to let slip without a mighty struggle—*to see Jesus as he is, and be like him.* Up then, every one of us, and so run than we may obtain.

2. *Obedience* equally with faith is essential to attain the purity spoken of. "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit," &c. 1 Pet. 1:22. "For as the body without breath is dead, so faith without works is dead also." James 1:26. It is vain to expect purity unless faith and obedience are united. Faith is the life principle, but it must *work* or it dies.—Let us see then the importance of obedience in order to purity. Faith and obedience comprehend the whole that is necessary to be said under this head of the subject. We come now, briefly—

III. TO URGE THE DUTY TO SEEK PURITY.

"Follow peace with all men, *and holiness* without which no man shall see the Lord." Heb. 12:14. Without purity, then, we shall be eternally excluded from the sight of the Lord, and we must, hence, "not see life"—future and eternal life cannot be ours. By impurity, or sin, we are unfitted for the society and employments of holy beings. What a loss is this? Who can comprehend its magnitude? No language can describe it. "Be ye holy, for I am holy," is the injunction of God upon us. Harmony with God must exist in us, or to dwell with Him we cannot.—Death—corruption—eternal night must be the portion of the impure and unholy.

Let us study the life of Jesus, and sincerely, and truly repent of all our departures from a likeness to him, seeking the mercy of God to forgive our shortcomings, and help us in time to come that we may become truly Christ like. Let us not faint because we find ourselves often to fail in the effort, but rather let those failures lead us to greater diligence and more earnest prayer for divine aid, for "in due time we shall reap if we faint not." Never should we allow discouragement to overpower us, as we shall often be tempted to do. Here is our true warfare, and though sometimes wounded and perhaps defeated, let us return to the conflict armed with "the whole armor of God," and ere long we shall be able to say, with the apostle to the Gentiles, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me in that day, and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Yes, if we have fought the good fight and attained a likeness to Christ here, we shall soon "see him as he is and be like him." Happy day—glorious hour, and fast approaching. A little longer struggle and the victory is won and the crown bestowed.

A Stricture. By Henry Grew.

Dear Brother Storrs: You affirm that "Paul never said any such thing" as that "there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust." Is it so? Let us see.

Acts 24:15. Paul speaking of himself, said, "and have hope toward God, which they themselves ALSO allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and unjust." What doth the word *also* import but that Paul himself allowed such a resurrection? Did he allow it because fallible and erring men believed it? No verily. No more than he would allow the worship of the goddess Diana, or the god Jupiter-Ammon by the same authority. The previous

verse shows that what he believed were "things written in the law and the prophets" who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Now if Paul allowed that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust, and implicitly said so, how can your affirmation be true? Is not his declaration *some* "such thing?"

HENRY GREW.

RESPONSE BY THE EDITOR.—In the first place, Br. GREW's stress on the term "*also*," in our mind, is unavailing. The original word is *kai*, and is translated variously in the New Testament: its first sense is that of *and*; it has the sense of *even*, *moreover*, *beside*, *further*, &c.. *Even* or *moreover*, is quite as likely to be the Apostle's meaning as "also."

Paul was a believer in the resurrection of Christ and of "the dead *in* Christ:" for preaching this doctrine he was accused of the Pharisees themselves; not because they were unbelievers in a resurrection of some sort; but they disliked the doctrine of Christ raised from the dead, and of life from the dead only through him. This they called "heresy," (v. 14,) as some do now. Paul professes that in his course of life and preaching he adheres to, and worships the God of the fathers, "believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets." Now, the "law" never speaks of a future life for the wicked, or of their revival from death; and hence Paul did not "allow" it; but the Pharisees did; and yet these same Pharisees charged Paul with "heresy" for preaching a resurrection less extensive than that which they allowed, or *admitted*—for so the original may be translated: they *admitted* a resurrection "both of the just and unjust," which was more than was ever "written in the law or prophets:" holy men of old, who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," gave utterance to no such sentiments. Now, saith Paul, "I believe all things written in the law and in the prophets: and have hope toward God:"—*hope* of what? Of that which was *common* to all men? Nay, verily, as his language, Phil. 3: 11, clearly shows—"If by *any means* I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Why this implied *doubt*, if the resurrection of all men was a settled fact, when the apostle "allowed?" Could he fail of that which was certain to all? Paul, then, did not allow the resurrection was universal; but the Pharisees did admit such a resurrection, and yet condemned Paul as guilty of "heresy" for preaching the resurrection of "hope" by Jesus Christ.

Such are the facts in the case; and Paul rebukes these Pharisees for their hypocrisy in condemning him for preaching the resurrection, "which they themselves *moreover* allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." With such an *admission* on their part, why do they condemn him for proclaiming the resurrection of Christ, and of all that fall asleep in Christ? That such, and no other, was Paul's proclamation, concerning the resurrection of the dead, is clear from Phil. 3: 11; 1 Thess. 4: 13–18; and the entire chapter of 1 Corth. 15. "If Paul allowed that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust," we wish Br. Grew to find where he taught such doctrine, and not rest it on a doubtful text.—Where did he ever say, in all his preaching or epistles, *the wicked dead shall live again?* or shall be raised from the dead? We say again, "Paul never said any such thing." Such a plain outspoken preacher as Paul did something more than speak doubtfully: he stated distinctly the grand fact of the resurrection of "the dead in Christ." If the awful doctrine of the wicked dead made alive, tormented, and killed again were true, we may depend Paul would not have left his hearers, and those to whom he wrote, to *infer* it. The great apostle to the Gentiles was not such a man. When taking his final leave of the elders of the church of Ephesus, he saith "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you, and taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Acts 20: 20, 21, To what end was this faith in Christ? To the end that they might have the promise of Christ fulfilled unto them.—"I will raise *him* up at the last day." John 6: 40. Repentance toward God and faith in Christ are essential to being raised up from the dead "at the last day;" and, "he that believeth not shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3: 36.

Paul in writing to the Ephesian church, after he had taken his last personal leave of them, calls their attention specially to the resurrection of Christ, and to the fact that the same power that raised him from the dead would quicken them "together with Christ:" that "through Jesus' blood we have the forgiveness of sins;" and he taught the Corinthians, if our sins are not forgiven, when we die, we "are perished:" 1 Corth. 15: 17, 18. Here we rest the question of Paul's "allowing" the revival of dead sinners into life. He never preached a *penal* resurrection: none such did he ever speak of.

Backsliding in Old Age.

Did it ever occur to you that Christians were more apt to backslide and fall into open sin in the latter part of their religious course, than in its earlier stages? It is a startling announcement, but I think you will find it true. Look at all the cases of backsliding recorded in the Bible. Did they not, every one of them, occur late in life? There was David. In the days of his youth and early manhood, a pattern of faith and devotion. In advanced life, guilty of murder and adultery, and still later of pride and self-conceit, in numbering the people. Look at Moses. The great sin of his life committed when just about to enter the promised land. Look at Hezekiah, the "good king Hezekiah." In his early days, zealous and devout. The last fifteen years of his life (a special gift from his God, and therefore one would think to be specially consecrated to him) bringing "wrath upon himself and upon Jerusalem." So too with Josiah. So too with Jehoshaphat. And look around at the cases of grievious backsliding within your own observation. Have they not, almost every one of them, occurred late in life? I mean, after many years of Christian profession.—This fact (is it not a fact?) seems to me to teach several lessons of deep and solemn importance.

1. It accounts for another fact which has of late forced itself upon my attention, viz., that in the case of very many of God's people, their heaviest and most numerous trials come late in life.—God, in his tender mercy, sends the trials to save them from falling away from their steadfastness, and bringing reproach upon his cause.

2. These cases, recorded in the Bible and confirmed by observation, ought to make Christians, as they advance in life, more and more watchful and distrustful of themselves.—*Parish Visitor.*

The foregoing remarks, on "back-sliding in old age," are worthy of consideration, so far as they admonish us who have advanced in life; yet we think the writer is under a serious mistake in several particulars. It is a melancholy sight to see an aged person backslide, and it is as rare as it is sorrowful. Most back-sliding is in the early stages of a religious life. Multitudes "run well" for a time who are soon "hindered." "*Many* of his disciples went back and walked no more with" Jesus, when he had taught them of life only through himself. See John 6: 66 and connection. This was in the early stage of their discipleship, and not in "old age." Peter denied his master when not more than thirty years of age. Judas betrayed Jesus about the same time of life, probably. We repeat, by far the greatest numbers of back-sliders are found in early life, and from the more recent converts to the religion of the Bible; and it is seldom that a man who in early life devotes himself to the service of God, and advances steadily to "old age" in that service, backslides; yet such events do sometimes occur, and they show us that at no period of christian experience can we with safety cease to watch and pray, or indulge the idea that our past devotion to God is any excuse to be remiss in our last days. Some who have been eminent in talents and labor have fallen in "old age" by the flattery they have received for previous services; they have been lifted up with pride and been ensnared to their wounding. But as a general rule, a life truly devoted to God from youth, with a consistent christian walk to "old age," will not be likely to be stained with wickedly departing from the Lord. It is true "that in case of very many of God'e people, their heaviest and most numerous trials come late in life;" not however for the reason assigned by the *Visitor*, but because as nature returns towards the helplessness of childhood the veteran pilgrim finds himself unable to maintain that buoyancy of spirit he did in manhood's maturity, so that depression of mind is a natural result, and great trials accompany it. Or, if such is not the cause of their trials, they may be accounted for on the ground that before the ultimate crowning of their graces with glory they are matured by greater trials than they could well have endured in their early christian experience. It is true that the fall or backsliding of an aged christian would attract more attention and bring more reproach on the cause of Christ than that of persons in their early pilgrimage.

The *Parish Visitor* in noticing the cases of old testament saints overlooked the fact, that it is only the shortcomings of *eminent* men he has noticed; and it is remarkable that they failed no more, considering the partial light of their dispensation. "The great sin of Moses' life" we hardly think was "committed when just about to enter the promised land." It seems to us, we might look back to his *youthful* days, when he slew the Egyptian on his own impulse, and find his zeal for the Lord venting itself in no ordinary sin.

Truly, however, "Christians, as they advance in life," ought to be "more and more watchful and distrustful of themselves." Long experience ought to have taught them, that without the grace and Spirit of God they can no more maintain a christian walk, in "old age," than in the first year of their christian experience. An entire leaning on God in Christ, and an earnest seeking the Holy Spirit's aid should characterise us who are near "old age;" that our "end may be peace."

Christianity in the Chinese Revolution.

In the *North China Herald*, published at Shanghai, June 7th, 1856, we find a very extended

and elaborate letter, addressed by one of the missionaries, Mr. W. A. P. Martin, to the Attorney-General of the United States, setting forth the condition and principles of the great Chinese rebellion. He regards the movement as eminently *Christian* in its inception and progress, and on its success he founds strong hopes of the spread of true religion in China. Mr. Martin says that "latterly it has been hinted that the insurgents are laying aside their profession of Christianity. This is, however, a groundless conjecture, thrown out with a design to disparage the revolution. Such an event is next to impossible in the nature of things. Christianity is so interwoven with the entire constitution of the party, that they cannot exclude it without hazarding its dissolution. The Chief claims the throne by virtue of a commission from the heavenly Father, and publishes to his people that he has achieved his most splendid victories by the help of Jesus. And it is by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost that the Eastern king pretends to guide his counsels. They cannot, therefore, drop these pretensions without forfeiting the semi-idolatrous reverence with which they are regarded by their followers; they cannot abjure Christianity without invalidating every decree issued since the commencement of the revolution, and abrogating their whole political system. Indeed, so zealous have the insurgent leaders been in diffusing a knowledge of the rudiments of Christianity among their own followers, and so successful in imparting their own zeal, that there is not now on the face of the earth any other military body which is so fully pervaded with religious enthusiasm.

"Here on the borders of the contested region, we have frequent opportunities of meeting with those who have been among the rebels. One of my misionary colleagues copied a hymn, which contains a beautiful summary of Christian doctrine, from the recitation of a Ningpo man, who had been for a time detained among them: and I have myself obtained the same from two others, one a native of Nanking, and the other a refugee from Chin-kiang. The account of the practices of the insurgents given by the latter is so interesting that I shall relate a few particulars. Immediately on entering the city, religious tracts were put into his hands; after reading and approving of which he received the rite of baptism, by kneeling, (in company with others,) repeating the above-mentioned hymn, with a doxology to the Trinity, renouncing his sins, swearing fidelity to the cause, and then washing his bosom with a towel, which they call 'cleansing heart.' The Sabbath, though not strictly observed, owing to the interruptions incidental to a state of war, was still distinguished from other days. On the evening previous, a banner was hoisted, bearing the inscription: 'The morrow is the day of worship: beware of disregarding it.' At daybreak on Sabbath morning the troops were called together for prayer, and at a later hour they assembled in places called 'worshipping halls,' to hear a discourse from some officer, on the righteousness of their cause, the certainty of success, the wickedness of idolatry, and the oppression of the Tartars; or in lieu of such service, which was always accompanied by prayer, to be examined as to their acquaintance with the religious manuals of the party. Those most esteemed were, the ten commandments with notes; the ode for youth, commencing with a brief but correct statement of Christian doctrine, and concluding with the duties of the social relations; the Trimetrical classic, which, after giving an epitome of the book of Genesis, and a detailed account of the deliverance from Egypt, speaks of the coming of Jesus Christ to save the world, and then proceeds to describe the mission of the 'celestial king' to deliver China from the Tartars. Of these the narrator repeated from memory considerable portions, together with a hymn and prayers, which each soldier is expected to recite daily as a devotional exercise. Those whose hair had grown long in the service were generally the most devout, and were often seen on their knees repeating their morning prayer, while putting on their clothes; but their later adherents who had learned those forms by constraint, would slip away to their breakfast without prayer, unless they were observed by some officer. They were even required to say a separate grace before meat. In times of peculiar danger they were accustomed to fall down, at any time, and in any place, and implore the Divine assistance."

The success of the insurrection, Mr. Martin contends, may be useful to the cause of Christianity, but its suppression cannot be otherwise than pernicious.

The Bishop of Victoria has also publicly stated that "if foreign intervention shall restore the sinking fortunes of the Imperialists, then it may be confidently predicted that the civilization of this vast empire will be hopelessly postponed; and the conversion to Christianity of this people will (to human view,) be indefinitely delayed. . . . . The pæns of Manchou triumph will be the melancholy dirge of a vast nation, having her liberties entombed among the dead, and sinking into the lowest depths of political annihilation."

Christianity, in the eye of many of this people, is already identified with the insurgent cause; and while it prejudices them against the revolution, their animosity would, in the event of its failure, (as they mistake for its cause that which is only a concomitant,) recoil against foreigners for causing them to "suffer so many things in vain, if it be yet in vain." Missionaries would be treated as political incendiaries, and the Bible would be proscribed as a dangerous book.—*Christian Advocate.*

Chrysostom, speaking on the composition of a sermon, says, as in a reverie: I had a vision: I thought I saw the communion-rails crowded with angels listening to the sermon. When a man speaks as in the sight of God, with an open heaven —with Christ and angels before him—he catches the true prophetic fire; he offers a present salvation, from a present Saviour; the Spirit of glory and grace descends, and the flame communicates to his auditory, and accompanies them to their houses.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

SUBSCRIBERS wishing to pay personally, or sending by private hands, for the EXAMINER for 1857, may do so to GEO. YOUNG, partner in R. T. YOUNG's *Letter File*, 109 Nassau Street, New York; who is authorized to act for us in the matter.

Our *Office and residence* is at 62 *Hicks Street*, Brooklyn, a short distance from Fulton Ferry, where we shall be happy to see any of our friends.

One number more completes the present volume of the BIBLE EXAMINER. We thank our friends for past favors.

To encourage early payments—which are much to our advantage—we make the following offers, to such as forward us the cash before December 25th, where papers are sent to *one address*, in the *States*.

Out of the States we must ask the additional sum of *twelve* cents for each copy ordered.

For *two* copies $3; for *five* copies $7; for *ten* opies $10.

If either of these offers are accepted, let it be distinctly understood, we send the whole number in one envelope, to one individual; and we do not need the name of any other person.

To single subscribers, who pay $2 before Dec. 25th, we will give *two* copies of either of the following works—the subscriber to pay the postage on them—*viz:* "MAN'S DESTINY;" "DOBNEY ABRIDGED;" "THE DISCUSSION" with Prof. Mattison; or, we will give one copy of "BIBLE vs. TRADITION," in paper cover, and pay the postage on it ourself. If any prefer, *instead* of either the foregoing offers, a copy of the "*Revised and Enlarged* SIX SERMONS" we will give them that; but they must pay the postage on it. We will, instead of either of these works, give "OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN," bound; the subscriber paying the postage. This is a valuable and interesting work.—In all cases of our sending books or pamphlets into Canada the postage must be *prepaid;* let our friends there remember this.

Money sent for the BIBLE EXAMINER is at *our risk*, provided the letter is sealed with a wafer and directed as follows—

GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New York.*

☞ Take care to put no other words or figures in the direction, as it will be at *your risk* if you do.

On the Witness of the Spirit.

The witness of the Spirit is a thing that we cannot express; a certain inexpressible assurance that we are the children of God; a certain secret manifestation that God hath received us and put away our sins. No one knows it but they that have it. I confess it is a wondrous thing. and if there were not some Christians that did feel it and know it, you might believe there was no such thing; but it is certain there is a generation of men that know what the seal of the Lord is.—*Preston.*

The testimony of the Spirit is immediate, by his secret influence upon the heart, quieting and calming all distrust and diffidence concerning its condition, by his own immediate power. Fear is banished by a soft whisper from the Spirit of God in the heart; and this in such a way that, though the spirit of man is calmed by it, yet it cannot tell how it comes to pass.—*Simon Ford.*

God hath been pleased to give us the witness of the Spirit in the way of an immediate impression. The Spirit, as a "Spirit of adoption," testifies to the believer's soul that he belongs to God. As, by the "sealing of the Spirit," he stamps his own image on his children for the conviction of others, so, by "the witness of the Spirit," he testifies to their adoption for the more immediate comfort of their own souls. Do not condemn the witness of the Spirit merely because you cannot comprehend it; rather pray to God that you yourself may be his children. In this way you may hope that the Spirit will testify of your adoption.—*Charles Simeon.*

It is the office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of our adoption as sons, to create within us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, and to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. As, therefore, we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our regeneration, so we are also assured by the same Spirit of our adoption; and because, being sons, we are also heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ by the same Spirit, we have the pledge, or rather the earnest of our inheritance.—*Bishop Pearson*

We may abound in meetings and in movements; enthusiastic gatherings in field or forest may kindle all minds with a common sentiment; great revivals may bear away thousands in a torrent of sympathy; but it is all in vain if men do not retire from the tumult to the silent culture of every right disposition, and the quiet practice of every duty; in vain, unless they patiently engrave the commandments of God on the inward tables; unless they hear a still small voice in the soul, and retain a warmth there, when the noise has ceased, and the flames have died away, as on the mount of ancient revelation.—*Selected.*

BIBL

NO IMMORTALITY, NO

VOL. XI.

PUBLISHED SEM

TERMS—Two Doll

Always in A

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR

NATURE AND IM

When we endeavor to
discover the character of th
seen, by the light of nature
mands our attention is t
which nature divulges the
Having learned this, we ar
enter upon the investigati
may come under our observ

How then do we learn of
future or unseen? Let th
then we may advance wi
hope of ultimately arriving

I conceive the only mean
any light from nature, up
fixing general principles by
following those principles
precluded. When we see
tunnel we justly conclude
the tunnel is the same as w
have previously established
always run upon certain rai
so when we reason from na
destiny, we must first sett
servation, then follow that
known future, and thus we
knowledge nature can affo
to all principles there may
reasoning from nature these
be allowed, unless there is fi
necessity for them. This p
will always prevent a demo
and such exceptions may
known, where we now see
them, but it is still self-evid
sible exceptions the basis of
nore reason and nature, and
less ocean of conjecture. W
what we *know*. Our premi
truths established directly
evidences of the senses, no
have as little to do with ob
with fact; and thus reasonin
might give us many lessons.

Having laid down the prin
be guided, I now propose to
for some of the truths made
cerning the constitution of

hath received us and put away
nows it but they that have it.
drous thing. and if there were
that did feel it and know it,
iere was no such thing; but it
generation of men that know
Lord is.—*Preston.*

the Spirit is immediate, by
pon the heart, quieting and
and diffidence concerning its
n immediate power. Fear is
hisper from the Spirit of God
is in such a way that, though
calmed by it, yet it cannot tell
s.—*Simon Ford.*

eased to give us the witness of
y of an immediate impression.
pirit of adoption," testifies to
at he belongs to God. As,
he Spirit," he stamps his own
n for the conviction of others,
of the Spirit," he testifies to
e more immediate comfort of
not condemn the witness of
cause you cannot comprehend
od that you yourself may be
s way you may hope that the
of your adoption.— *Charles*

he Holy Ghost to assure us
is, to create within us a sense
f God toward us, and to give
everlasting inheritance. As,
rn again by the Spirit, and
regeneration, so we are also
Spirit of our adoption; and
we are also heirs, heirs of
ith Christ by the same Spirit,
or rather the earnest of our in-
Pearson

n meetings and in movements;
gs in field or forest may kindle
mmon sentiment; great revi-
thousands in a torrent of sym-
in vain if men do not retire
the silent culture of every
the quiet practice of every
s they patiently engrave the
od on the inward tables; un-
small voice in the soul, and
re, when the noise has ceased,
died away, as on the mount
n.—*Selected.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. XI. NEW-YORK, DECEMBER 15, 1856. NO. 24.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NATURE AND IMMORTALITY.

When we endeavor to explore the future, or discover the character of those things that are unseen, by the light of nature. the first thing that demands our attention is to learn the means by which nature divulges the truths in her keeping. Having learned this, we are at once prepared to enter upon the investigation of any subject that may come under our observation.

How then do we learn of nature touching things future or unseen? Let this point be fixed and then we may advance with safety—with some hope of ultimately arriving at just conclusions.

I conceive the only means by which we can gain any light from nature, upon the unknown, is by fixing general principles by observation, and then following those principles where observation is precluded. When we see a train of cars enter a tunnel we justly conclude that the track within the tunnel is the same as without it, because we have previously established the principle that cars always run upon certain rails beneath them. Just so when we reason from nature upon our future destiny, we must first settle a principle from observation, then follow that principle into the unknown future, and thus we may receive whatever knowledge nature can afford us. It is true that to all principles there may be exceptions, but in reasoning from nature these exceptions can never be allowed, unless there is first shown an evident necessity for them. This possibility of exception will always prevent a demonstration from nature, and such exceptions may even exist in the unknown, where we now see no reason to look for them, but it is still self-evident that to make possible exceptions the basis of an argument is to ignore reason and nature, and launch on the boundless ocean of conjecture. We must reason from what we *know*. Our premises must be positive *truths* established directly or indirectly by the evidences of the senses, not wild theories that have as little to do with observation as fancy has with fact; and thus reasoning it is possible, nature might give us many lessons.

Having laid down the principle by which I shall be guided, I now propose to enter upon a search for some of the truths made known by nature concerning the constitution of man, and his chances for a future existence. For the present I shall attempt no demonstration, but having found some facts, and settled some general truths concerning those facts, I shall deduce the conclusions.

In the first hasty survey we take of man, we discover, prominent in his character, the desire of life and of immortality; which is but the desire of life indefinitely extended into the future. To prove that the desire of life is universal, we have only to appeal to the disposition shown to preserve it, and to the united testimony of every sane mind. No man desires non-existence. The suicide may choose it, not because there is in nonentity anything desirable, but because he thereby hopes to escape certain other and greater evils. If life without misery could be retained, or secured, by a simple volition, death would be unknown. So far as I know, the fact that all men desire immortality has never been questioned; and should any man proclaim himself an exception, the world would look upon him as one beside himself. Let this fact then be noted—*All mankind desire immortality.*

Following the plan I have marked out, I now proceed to fix certain general principles concerning human desire, and thus a path will be formed upon which we can enter the future.

I observe in myself and other beings of my nature, a multitude of desires, some operating only under certain circumstances, as hunger. thirst. desire of rest; others more general in their object and continual in their action, as the desire for wealth and knowledge; and still another class, more comprehensive than either of the foregoing, as the desire for happiness, and immortality. To the agency of these desires, operating singly, or in combination, we owe every voluntary action of our lives. From their stimulation arises all the marvelous energy and activity of the human character. A moment's consideration will make this apparent. Take from man the desire for food, and the race would soon be exterminated. Take from him the desire for wealth and knowledge, and all would sink into idleness, or be only active to supply their immediate wants. Commerce and manufacture would be at an end, and a universal lethargy would pervade the world. Let man lose the desire for future life, and who would seek immortality? In short, take from human nature the one ingredient of desire, and it is easy to see our existence would be impossible.

Here then, I think, is fixed one general truth connected with desire—that it is the impelling power which nature uses to urge us to seek some real good.

Again, there is every reason to believe, that under certain circumstances, nature has provided

for the gratification of every desire she has given: for if nature's God is a being of goodness he would not tantalize his creatures with desires for the satisfaction of which he had made no provision. But aside from this, observation shows us that every desire points toward some object. In natural desire the object is real, and, under specified conditions, attainable; as the desire for food, drink, and knowledge. In perverted desire the object is sometimes real and attainable; as in avarice and ambition, and sometimes imaginary, as in the paradise of the Musselman, and the heaven of the spiritualist. Observation, then, teaches this fact, that all *natural* desires and many perverted ones may be gratified. This is a second general truth.

A third truth is, that desire always implies conditions; or, in other words, that nothing which we desire can be secured but by effort made by ourselves.

If true, this is a most important principle; and that it is true, a little reflection will convince the most skeptical. Hunger and thirst, imply the necessity of procuring something to eat or drink; and unless the soil is tilled, the seed sown, and harvest gathered, all our desires would not save us from famine and death. So of our desire for health; it can only be gratified by obeying the physical laws under which we live.

This is the case with all those desires which recur at regular intervals, or exist only under specified circumstances; they point directly to conditions, without compliance with which not one of them ever has been satisfied, or ever can be. Every desire connected with our animal organization comes to us as active beings, and we must forego its gratification or comply with its demands.

If we look at another class of desires, not necessarily universal, as the desire of wealth, civil or military distinction, we find the same thing true of them. How has it been with every man that has been distinguished for success in his favorite pursuit? Whether in oratory, war, science, or literature, the best years of long lives, or the mightiest efforts of surpassing genius, have been essential to perfect their various designs. Human greatness has always been bought at the price of severe and constant toil.

The desire of fame has always imposed upon its votaries labor as the only condition by which the end could be attained. That "there is nothing worth having that can be had without labor" depends on the truth that desire always implies conditions.

So far then, whether we look at man as an animal or an intellectual being, we find everywhere connected with desire conditions. Let us approach still nearer the desire of immortality, to those of life and happiness. Except the desire of life, that of happiness, in its universality and comprehensiveness, absorbs all other desires that pertain to our present state. And who can doubt that happiness is conditional? Let us gaze for an instant around us. The whole world is in motion—ceaseless activity pervades every community—heartless despotism—the most cruel oppression, murder, robbery, and vice in all its forms, blight the fair face of the earth. The ocean is whitened with the commerce of all nations; manufactures of almost innumerable variety are to be met with in every quarter of the globe, and agriculture is pursued with an earnestness that shows an object of importance in view. Nor does this busy world lack noble instances of philanthropy and self-sacrifice to the general good. All mankind, by means innumerable, are eagerly, often mostly in pursuit of some end, to attain which all their energies are put in requisition;—that end is happiness. All seek to comply with what they conceive to be the conditions by which the end can be gained. The practical opinion of all the race is, that happiness is conditional; and were there no other reason, the experience of every day would place the question beyond doubt. The desire of life is, perhaps, the strongest feeling of our nature; and it is most intimately connected with that of immortality, which is simply life indefinitely extended in the future. But, that life is conditional none will deny.

This examination might be pursued, but the result would be invariably the same. No sooner would desire develop itself, than conditions for its gratification would immediately follow. This is so obvious to every observing mind as to need no proof. Desire and conditions always go hand in hand, and there is no hazard in saying, that *not one instance* of the unconditional gratification of natural desire can be produced.

I think my third principle is established, and will add, as self-evident, that we never desire to obtain what we now possess, or to retain what we cannot lose.

Here are four principles:—

1. That desire is the impelling power which nature uses to urge man to seek or retain some real good.

2. That nature has under certain circumstances provided for the gratification of every desire she has given.

3. That no desire can be gratified except the individual in whom it exists complies with certain conditions.

4. That we never desire to obtain what we now possess, or to retain what we can by no possibility lose.

The first position was—that all desire immortality; and an examination of natural desire shows the four propositions also to be universally true; thus the premises are complete, and the conclusions are apparent.

1. Desire is the impelling power which nature uses to urge men to seek or retain some real good. *Therefore* immortality is a real good, which nature, by desire, urges us to seek or retain. We cannot desire to retain it, because we do not know that we are immortal. True, men not seldom say they are conscious of indwelling immortality, when in truth they are *conscious* of exactly the reverse, but hope there is something within of which they are not conscious, that can never die: therefore nature does not urge us to retain immortality. But if this were not the case—(4)—we never desire to retain what we cannot lose; therefore, however durable our natures might be, there would be a

possibility of death. But (4) we never desire to obtain what we now possess: yet we desire to obtain immortality, and consequently do not now possess it.

2. Nature—or rather nature's God—has made provision for the gratification of every desire he has given: he has given the desire of immortality; and hence has somewhere made provision for its gratification—man may be immortal.

3. The gratification of every natural desire depends on our compliance with conditions; and it follows that immortality is *conditional*. These conditions are not revealed in nature, and hence the necessity for some other revelation. But desire is a universal energizing force given to urge us to seek out those conditions, or comply with them when known; and without it we should care as little for the future as the day-fly, whose existence is bounded by the setting sun. But man is made capable of a nobler destiny: he grasps the unending future, and is filled with inexpressible longings for life—eternal life: and these aspirations are the voice of God urging him to seek and use the means by which he may be made immortal.

To reason then from the known to the unknown, so far as desire is concerned, the inevitable conclusion is, conditional immortality. There is no escape, no evasion. Nature never came nearer a mathematical demonstration.

Yet, who has not heard that the longing we feel for endless existence is the "voice of God proclaiming our immortal destiny!" That is, all men desire immortality, therefore all will be immortal! Let us apply the same logic to other subjects. All men desire happiness, therefore all will be happy! All desire food and clothing, therefore no one can be hungry or naked! All desire health, and hence sickness is unknown! What sane man believes such nonsense? Still, in the eye of reason, it is just as near truth as the position that all men desire immortality, and hence all will be immortal.

Suppose however my premises are wrong—that all men do not desire immortality, and that the four propositions drawn from the fact of desire are untrue. What then? Simply this:—Non-existence. Universal immortality, and conditional immortality, would both fall together, unless one or the other could be proved true from other premises; for though it is true, that if immortality is inherent, we could no more desire it, than we could desire the light of the sun when it is shining upon us in mid-day brilliancy, yet the fact that we do *not* desire immortality would be far enough from proving that we possess it. If we deny the evidence of desire upon this subject, to me, it appears that the strongest, if not the only argument, against universal and eternal nonentity is broken down.—Where does nature clearly indicate even the possibility of eternal life, if not by our desires? It is said, and with apparent plausibility, that the capabilities of our nature afford presumptive evidence that we shall have a future and eternal existence.

This argument will hardly bear the light; for however we look on the human organization, it must be granted that physically, intellectually, and morally, it is imperfect, or in that condition in which surrounding circumstances will inevitably lead to that imperfection. We cannot suppose the God of nature created man with this inherent imperfection, or incapacity to resist those expressive forces which produce that imperfection: hence man must have fallen from some position where his capabilities might have been harmoniously developed; and when this degeneracy occurred the elements of discord and evil were introduced, though many of his capabilities still remained. Now, when man thus became degenerate the mystery is that he was not destroyed at once and forever—a mystery that *nature* cannot explain; but Revelation can—"For God so *loved* the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not *perish* but have everlasting life."

Aside from this, however, if we can affirm with reason that the God of nature would not create such capacities with a view to their final destruction; with equal reason we can affirm, that he would not create them with a view to their remaining undeveloped, or in idleness. Yet in the immense majority of our race the development of their capacities has been in obedience to the same law that develops the capacities of the brute—that of necessity: and nearly all those powers which are said to give man right to expect immortality have lain dormant; and if thus they lie dormant a life time, it cannot be very unreasonable that they should remain so forever. Again, if it is unreasonable that those capacities should be destroyed, it is much more so that they should be perverted and used to blight the earth with crime and woe: but that they are thus used none will deny. Hence, I conclude that the destruction of these capacities is not near so unreasonable as their existence a lifetime in idleness, or their perversion to produce misery; and no more so than the simple fact of human existence in its present degenerate state: and therefore we are driven back to desire, as the foundation which nature gives for any hope of immortality. Thus if my premises are denied the only result is to take away all hope of an endless existence, and to doom the race to nonentity!

I think I have shown that the utmost that can be proved by human desires is, conditional immortality; and that the strongest argument presented by nature for endless being is found in desire.

In looking at these conclusions one cannot help observing that the God of nature, who in the gift of desire indicated that he had prepared the means for its gratification, is the same God who has "brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." Desire gives man reason to hope for future life as something that can be secured by complying with conditions which nature does not reveal. But here, where nature is silent, the God of nature reveals to man the means by which he may become immortal: here, where the wisdom of man and the voice of nature have been alike important to give assurance of life, the Creator, by direct irradiation, illuminates the distant boundless future. The "*Light of Life*" dispels the doubts which nature leaves, and meets us with the

assurance that of all things, that are committed unto him, nothing shall be lost; but he will raise it up at the last day. He has severed the bands of death, and at his command the sepulchre shall vainly desire longer to retain its unconscious inmates.

Only by faith in him can that universal desire for being be gratified. He alone holds the keys of death and hell, and he only can unlock the grave, and give life to the sleeping dead; for he only can redeem the soul from the power of the grave.

M.

THE SUBORDINATE REIGN OF CHRIST.

BY GEORGE DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

I shall now endeavor to prove that Messiah will assume a kingdom, immediately upon his second advent; and, in the next place, to shew that this will be the subordinate reign; I shall then inquire into the place, the nature, and the duration of this kingdom.

The first passage which I shall notice is 2 Tim. iv. 1: "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." That this appearing will be a personal, bodily appearing, I believe all allow, because it is the coming of Christ to judgment; but then his kingdom follows upon his appearing, and the judgment is carried on whilst Christ is in his kingdom.

The next passage which I shall mention is Heb. i. 6—9, in which place the apostle quotes a verse from Ps. civ. 4; but turning to the Psalm, we find that the verse cited by St. Paul is not spoken by God either *of* the angels, as our version of the epistle to the Hebrews affirms, or *unto* the angels, as the marginal reading would indicate. I therefore understand the apostle to introduce the citation parenthetically, in acknowledgment of the dignity and duty of angels: "And unto the angels He speaks [even He] who maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire." The other verses will then be understood in this manner:

"But when He shall bring again* the first-begotten into the habitable earth, he saith,
"And let all the angels of God worship Him;"
"But unto the Son"—
"Thy throne O God [is] for ever and ever."

Thus there is an opposition between what is *at the same time* said unto the angels and unto the Son; thereby shewing that when He shall come again into the world, He will come to his throne; for the passage must be read with this connexion, "When He brings again the first-begotten into the habitable earth, he saith, 'Thy throne O God is for ever and ever.'"

Our Lord marks precisely the period when He shall sit upon his own throne, saying, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of his glory." This, I believe, all men acknowledge to be a literal personal advent: those who deny the personal reign, say that it denotes the day of judgment; and the personal millenarians generally, I believe, suppose that it refers to the judgment of the quick at the appearing of Jesus Christ. According to either view, therefore, it must be admitted that at that period of his coming He will sit upon the throne of his glory: for, as I before observed, "when" and "then," standing in relation to each other in this manner, are tantamount to saying, that at that time, and not until that time, will the Son of man sit upon this throne. It will be "the throne of the glory of the Son of man," a glorious throne suitable to the glory of the Son of man.

As our Lord, when upon earth, without any explanation assumes this title, "Son of man," as his general designation, we may take it for granted that He supposed its meaning ought to have been known; and if so, from whence could it have been learned but from the Old Testament? Indeed, upon one occasion, Messiah directly establishes what belongs to his office as Son of man, from the use of that title in the prophets. "And [the Father] hath given Him (the Son of God, ver. 18.) authority to execute judgment also, *because He is the Son of man.*" The Lord affirms, that because He is Son of man, that therefore He has the authority to execute judgment; but we find this authority given to the Son of man only in Dan. vii. 9, 13, 14, to which, therefore, I conceive our Lord must refer.

This prophecy of Daniel is one of exceeding importance and considerable difficulty, but the only points which bear directly upon our immediate inquiry are the succession and subordination of the kingdom here mentioned. "I beheld until the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit;" the time appears to be when Christ "shall have put down all rule and all authority and power," and therefore, "When He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." Now, as in the vision the beasts symbolize not individual kings, but kingdoms which shall arise out of the earth, so, by congruity of interpretation, I am led to suppose that the session of "the Ancient of days" is not intended to symbolize God, but the reign of God "all in all;" to which, however, will belong some visible and manifested glory upon this earth. Ver. 13: "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days and they brought Him near before Him, and there was given Him dominion and glory, and a kingdom," &c. This verse I likewise understand to symbolize the establishment of Messiah's throne; having resigned the co-ordinate reign. He receives for himself a

* The marginal rendering of Heb. i. 6 is to be preferred, because Psalm xcvii. from which the quotation is taken, refers not to the first advent, but to when Jesus shall come "*again* into the world." And that "again" cannot be understood in the sense of *another quotation* is evident, because the verse quoted is intended to prove a different clause from the preceding citations; those in verse 5 establish the "excellent name" of Son, but this in verse 6 proves the superiority to angels; it is not, therefore, a *second* quotation, but the first, which is advanced to prove that point.

kingdom,* which proves the succession : the subordination is clearly marked by verse 27, for it is that which is shared with the people of God.

Psalm viii. celebrates the subjection of all things to the Son of man. The intimate relation of this passage to the 1st chapter of Genesis is evident. And I think we learn from St. Paul's comment, in Heb. ii., that David applies to the second Adam as the antitype, that which in Genesis is spoken with relation to the first Adam, as the type of Messiah. I will, therefore, first turn to Genesis in order to show in what manner Adam is spoken of as the type of Christ.

"God said, Let us make Adam in our image . . , so God created Adam in his image : in the image of God created He him." It appears from the passage that God addressed some one respecting the creation of Adam. If it be asked, "With whom took He counsel?" I answer, that He who proposed the creation of Adam was God the Father: but that He who actually created Adam was Christ.

That the purpose and source of all is to be attributed to the Father, is generally admitted : it is the first article of our creed, that God the Father was maker of heaven and earth : this, however, does not exclude the Son, but, on the contrary, in the order of working, the actual formation is by the Son, while the purpose is attributed to God the Father. This may be rested upon one text : "To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him : and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him."

I said, in the second place, that He who actually created Adam was Christ ; this must be included in the assertion made by Paul to the Ephesians, that "God created all things *by Jesus Christ ;*" that is, the God-man in his office-character—or "assumed relation," as Mr. Vaughan termed it—created all things. So, in Gen. ii. 2, where the completion of creation by God is recorded : "And on the seventh day God ended his work which He had made," President Edwards observes, that the word translated "work" most properly signifies a work done in the execution of some function, to which the workman is appointed as the *messenger* of another. So "wisdom," in Proverbs viii., which is generally attributed to Jesus Christ, says, "I was set up," or "I was anointed from everlasting ;" and the following verses declare that the office to which He was anointed was creation. "When He appointed the foundations of the earth, then," says Wisdom, "I was by Him [as] one brought up with Him." So it is translated in the authorised version ; but the learned Francis Taylor renders it, "Then was I by Him as an artificer with Him."

It would follow, from what has been advanced, that Adam was created in the image of Christ the God-man ; for God who created him, created him in his [own] image. And we have seen that He who did create was the Christ. This, however, must not be understood to the exclusion of God the Father, for He said, "Let us make Adam in our image ;" both, therefore, seem to be embraced in the scripture account, for it says, "So God created Adam in his image," and then it adds, "in the image of God created He him." And perhaps in the proposition of God, the same is implied, for He not only says, "Let us make man in our image," but He adds, "after our likeness."* But as Christ himself is "the image of God," so Adam being created immediately in Christ's own image, was created ultimately in the image of God. Hence man is called the image of God, and Adam is also expressly styled "the type of the coming One."—Rom. v. 14.

Adam was the type of Christ ; in the constitution of his person ; in his relation to Eve ; and in his having dominion ; which last appears principally intended in Genesis, and is exclusively noticed in the viiith Psalm, and is the subject to which my inquiry is at present confined.

"God said, Let us make man in our image . . . and let him have dominion : so God created man in his image." In the blessing, therefore, He conferred the dominion ; and Boothroyd does not hesitate to make the connexion much more intimate ; for he renders it, "Let us make man . . . according to our own likeness, that they may have dominion." And Tillock translates it, "Then OMNIPOTENCE† said, We will make man in our image . . . and they shall have dominion . . . thus OMNIPOTENCE created man . . . in the image of OMNIPOTENCE created He him."

Adam, then, was a type of Christ in his power and dominion. Now that which is typified must previously exist, at least in idea ; one thing cannot be made in the form, or mould, or representation of another, without the idea of the other existing in the mind of him who forms the type. But with respect to the Lord Jesus there was much more than the idea ; He actually existed as the WORD, and actually put forth his power as the Christ, in creation ; but with respect to the constitution o

* This interpretation appears to me to account satisfactorily for the kingdom being said to belong to the Son of man, (Dan. vii. 14,) but in the explanation, (verse 22,) to be possessed by the saints.

* "The similitude of the Lord" is apparently a personal title of the Lord Jesus in the Old Testament, (Numb. xii. 8,) and answerable to a similar denomination of Christ in the New Testament "The image of God."

† El certainly denotes power, and seems, when used as a title of God, intended to convey that idea. The plural, then, *Elohim*, would denote *powers ;* and when applied to Deity, may indicate all power, or *Omnipotence*. Thus rulers, I conceive, are called *Elohim* in the Old Testament, as representatives of Him, who shall govern all nations ; and to this title, probably, St. Paul alludes, when he says, "The *powers* that be, are ordained of God:" so he argues, in another place, that a man "ought not to cover his head ;" that is to have the sign of subjection to the power of another, as is the case with the woman, "Forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God ;" that is, he is the image of God in bearing rule. Hengstenberg will not allow that *Elohim* in the Old Testament ever means angels.—I do not see why it should not, as well as "Powers" in the New Testament.

his person as the God-man, his humanity having no more than a decretive subsistence, we can only consider Him in these respects as *virtually* set up, or in the *predestinative assumption of humanity*.

But in the order of the divine decrees, which have the relation of end and means among themselves, the purpose of the end precedes the purpose of the means; this is implied in Ephes. i. 11, where the apostle affirms that God works "after the counsel of his own will," in order to the accomplishment of his predestinative purpose. It would not, therefore, be the intermediate state of humiliation—for that would come under the decree of the means—but the ultimate state of glory to which the God-man was predestined, that would, according to our conceptions, be first in intention, in the Divine mind. *Glorified* humanity in the person of Jesus would therefore be the antitype, in the image of whom Adam was created as the type.

It is at this very point of view, so to speak, that I apprehend the psalmist is placed. He sees the Glory-man brought out the head of creation, and from that point he takes a retrospect of that suffering humanity, into the condition of which the Son of God descended, and from which He raised himself and will raise all united to Him.

The psalmist bursts out into an exclamation, "O Jehovah our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth! who hast set thy glory above the heavens." This must refer to that time when God's name, in itself essentially excellent, will be known and appreciated throughout all the earth, and when, to all appearance, there will be a higher manifestation of glory upon this planet than even in the heavens themselves. And when, instead of children as soon as they are born going astray and speaking lies, babes and sucklings will praise that strength which will have caused to cease the enemy and avenger.

"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers; the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained, what is man (*Enosh*, suffering man) that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man (Adam) that thou visitest him?" Some say that these meditations arose in the psalmist's mind at the feast of tabernacles, when dwelling in a booth which, according to the Jewish custom, was purposely so constructed that the stars should be seen. The feast of tabernacles would also be a suitable occasion, for it typified that rejoicing of universal nature which shall take place when God becomes "all in all." Be that, however, as it may, the tenor of this verse indicates a nocturnal scene, when the many distant worlds which are brought to our view, more strongly mark the comparative insignificance of this earth and its inhabitants.

These circumstances might *occasion* the psalm; but if, as I suppose, the royal prophet was in visional anticipation, himself in the kingdom of Messiah, and from thence taking a retrospect, we must realize in our mind that time when there will probably be a similar result, but from opposite causes; when there will be no night, and yet no need of the sun; when other worlds will not reflect the light of the sun; but the light emanating from the New Jerusalem.

I understand "man," in the 4th verse, to denote man universally, in his lost and ruined estate.—The "Son of man" I understand to be human nature individuated in the person of Christ Jesus, though not exclusively confined to Him, but in the same manner as Adam, his type was an individual, but also a federal head. Thus the dominion of the Son of man, in Ps. viii., will be extended to his fellows, as the dominion of the Son of man, in Dan. vii. 13, is shared by the people of the saints of the Most High, verse 27.

"Thou hast minished Him for a little in comparison with angels:" this necessarily implies a depression from a previous state of exaltation; the minishing was the actual incarnation in the likeness of sinful flesh; but from what was He depressed? The depression could not be of the Deity—that admits of no limitation, nor would that be a lessening of the Son of man. How, then, could there be a lowering of the human nature before it had any real existence, unless from that predestinative assumption of glorified manhood of which I have been speaking?

"For thou hast made Him for a little while lower than the angels, and hast crowned Him with glory and honor." The "little while" was the whole period of "the days of his flesh." The following clause denotes the co-ordinate reign at God's right-hand, for we now by faith "behold Jesus" . . . "crowned with glory and honor."

"Thou madest Him to have dominion over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things under his feet;" this is the reign of "the Son of man," which will extend over all that was lost in the first Adam: "All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea." This we may see for ourselves is still unfulfilled, and the apostle confirms it: "But now we see not yet all things subjected unto Him."

That this is the subordinate reign we learn from 1 Cor. xv. 27, for the apostle quotes this viiith Psalm in proof that all things are decretively subjected to Christ; and then he adds, (ver. 28,) "And when all shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son of man also himself be subject unto Him," &c. So that He receives this dominion upon his becoming subordinate.

* * * * * *

Before entering upon my next inquiry, which is respecting the nature of Messiah's kingdom, I will glance at the 2d Psalm, showing how all the points I have hitherto urged are there introduced.

It is a matter of great moment, as I have already intimated on the viiith Psalm, to observe the point of time at which the prophet is supposed to be placed. In Psalm viii. the seer was supposed to have anticipated the day of glory; in this Psalm the point of time is during this dispensation, and after the ascension; the events of that time are in the present tense: "Why do the heathen?" &c., events before that time, though occurring long after the Psalm was enunciated, would be in the past: "The Lord hath said unto me," at the time of the resurrection, "Thou art my Son," &c.—The events future to the session at God's right-

hand are of course spoken of in the future: "I will give thee the heathen," &c.

The first three verses show the opposition to Jehovah and his Christ by both Jew and Gentile, rulers and people, during the whole of this dispensation; commencing with Herod and Pontius Pilate, and continuing until the second advent. The first two verses are in the words of the psalmist, in the third verse he records the language of the Gentiles and the people. These verses denote the character of this present dispensation.

The fourth verse indicates Christ's present situation: "He sitting in the heavens shall laugh, *Adonai* shall have them in derision." This verse corresponds with Psalm cx.: "Jehovah said to *Adonai*, Sit thou at my right-hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool;" and establishes the co-ordinate reign during this dispensation, "whilst the Gentiles are raging," &c.

"Then shall He speak to them in his wrath and vex them in his sore displeasure," [saying,] "Yet am I anointed King upon my holy hill of Zion." This 5th verse marks the close of this dispensation, when Christ will cease to sit in the heavens; and when He will commence to reign in Mount Zion; the "then" of this verse is in opposition to the "now" of verse 10; "now" marking the present period of God's forbearance and long-suffering, "then" denoting the time when his wrath will be come. This verse, therefore, implies the Church's expectation.

As in the 3rd verse the psalmist records the words of the Gentiles, so in the 6th verse he relates the words which will be spoken at the time of the second advent; either by Jehovah, if we follow the Hebrew, or by Messiah, if we follow the Septuagint, which latter I prefer, because the wrath of the speaker in the 5th verse appears the same wrath as that of the Son, mentioned in the 12th verse. These, then, are the words of Messiah at the period of the second advent: "Yet (notwithstanding this opposition of Jew and Gentile,) am I anointed King upon my holy hill of Zion." But whether we suppose the words to be those of the Father or of Christ, they indicate his assumption of the subordinate throne, at the time when the Gentiles shall be visited with his sore displeasure: namely, at the close of this dispensation.

In the 7th, 8th, and 9th verses Messiah himself in his own person, is introduced as the speaker, declaring the Father's decree concerning Him: "I will declare the decree Jehovah said unto me," (when He raised Him from the dead, Acts xiii. 33,) "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," &c.

The decreed subjection of the heathen, mentioned in the 8th and 9th verses, will be fulfilled at the second advent, as Christ has promised to those who shall overcome, in Rev. ii. 27.

In the remainder of the Psalm, David speaks in his own person, urging kings and rulers to wisdom, before it be too late: "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth," &c.; the "*now*," verse 10, of the day of grace, being opposed to the "*then*," verse 5, of the day of wrath.

For the Examiner.

THE MEMORY OF THE JUST.

BY S. BATCHELOR.

The memory of the Just!
How blest, though some for ages long have slept
Their deeds like precious ointment now are kept.

They being dead yet speak;
Time past is witness for the faithful dead,
As blessings rest upon the honored head.

They who the burden bore,
And shrunk not in the heat of battle day,
How oft lamented, early past away.

Mothers in Israel,
Their deeds shall outlive time, unknown to fame
For which so many leave a Saviour's name.

Brother and sister dear,
Loved ones may not escape the general doom,
They sleep, how sweet their rest within the tomb.

But hope survives the gloom,
For they who died in faith, the witnesses
Have not as yet received the Promises.

And we shall meet again,
Yes, with them in the flesh shall see our God,
Should we remain, or sleep beneath the sod.

The soul's immortal birth,
Hail, blessed scene, the resurrection morn!
The righteous sown in death to life are born.

The memory of the Just!
How bright the past, but brighter still the rise
Of hope fulfilled, in new earth Paradise.

Behold the day-star rise;
Swift as an eagle's flight it comes—is here—
Eternity—no death—no falling tear.

Short Sayings.

A man whose ways please God, must be odd from the mass of mankind.

To go with the multitude of mankind, is to go with a multitude who do not think for themselves, but merely respond to the thoughts of a few ambitious persons who lead them.

Meekness, modesty, humility, and virtue, are jewels which are comely to be worn under all circumstances. E. B.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, December 15, 1856.

THE END of the present volume of our paper has come. It has been a year of labor and trial somewhat more than usual to us; but it has closed, and the result of all we leave with Him who "doeth all things well." We have no idea that we have given perfect satisfaction to all our readers, and some of them have not done so to us. Hence we will balance accounts and begin anew, forgetting the past, and striving to do as much better, for time to come, as our present imperfect state will permit. We see in part, and know in part, now: may the "perfect" speedily arrive, then that which is in part will be done away.—Till then we shall all have need of patience; and may it "have its perfect work."

The prospects of the BIBLE EXAMINER, for pecuniary support, the coming year are not as encouraging at this time as last year at the same time. We have determined we will not drum, dun, nor beg; we state the simple fact, and leave our friends to do what seemeth good to them in the matter. Without our present list of subscribers can be kept good, the paper *cannot* be issued *regularly*, *semi*-monthly; hence if it shall be found, early in January, that the receipts for 1857 are not sufficient to pay the cost of paper, and the Printer's bills, it is our intention—unless otherwise directed by the subscribers—to return all money received to those who have sent it, and *suspend* the issue of the paper for the present. If that is the pleasure of our subscribers, time will soon settle the matter.

The BIBLE EXAMINER was commenced in 1842, without a subscriber to help us forward. It was sent out as an *occasional* issue till 1847, when it was issued *monthly*, and was continued so till 1854. Since that, or for three years, it has been issued *semi*-monthly. Of itself, it has never been any pecuniary benefit to us, if we except the present year and one year while we issued it monthly.—The present year, as we have before stated, it has yielded us about *half* enough to pay the expenses of our family; but in order for this, we had to give up our office in the city of *New York*. If it is now to be *suspended* in its issue, on our own account, we shall have no regrets. If the friends of the cause we have advocated, judge they need its presence no longer, and that they can do no good to others by its circulation, we bow to their decision, and shall try, in our old age, to seek to do good in some more quiet calling; and thus, in our turn, we shall bid you all "*farewell*."

If the EXAMINER is continued it will not be sent to any one who has not complied with our terms of payment in *advance*. There is no occasion for any to write us to stop their paper. It will, at any rate, be discontinued from this number to all who do not remit pay in advance.

Our friends will see the last EXAMINER for the terms to those who take *two* or more copies, and also for a list of the premiums to those who send $2 for a single copy. Those who send for the works on which *they* are to pay the postage would do well to send Post Office stamps so as to *prepay* it; as that will be a saving to themselves.—That they may know just what is needed for this purpose we give the amount necessary to prepay on the different works. On "Man's Destiny," *five* cents. "Discussion" with Prof. Mattison, *five* cents. "Dobney Abridged," *six* cents.—"Revised and Enlarged Six Sermons," *ten* cents. "Our Israelitish Origin," *fourteen* cents. On each of these works, when sent as a premium, to subscribers, they are to pay the postage.

On "Bible vs. Tradition," in paper cover, when chosen instead of any of the foregoing, *one* copy is sent free of postage. On it we pay *nine* cents.

All persons receiving the BIBLE EXAMINER will please remember, they can pay the postage at their own Post Office just as cheap as they can do it through us at this Office. Any distance less than 3000 miles the postage is but a *half cent* if paid quarterly *in advance*; that is, *three* cents for three months. It subjects us to considerable trouble to pay it here. On papers going out of the States we are obliged to pay the postage.

Money sent for the BIBLE EXAMINER is at *our risk*, provided the letter is sealed with a wafer and directed as follows—

GEO. STORRS, *Box* 4658, *New York*.

Take care to put no other words or figures in the direction, as it will be at *your risk* if you do.

SUBSCRIBERS wishing to pay personally, or sending by private hands, for the EXAMINER for 1857, may do so to GEO. YOUNG, partner in R. T. YOUNG'S *Letter File*, 109 Nassau st., New York; who is authorized to act for us in the matter.

"SIX SERMONS," *Revised and Enlarged*—Those who have read this work, have found very much matter not in the *Original:* besides an entire new sermon on "*Christ the Life-Giver.*" In addition to this, it is printed with a large clear type, thus affording much more satisfaction in reading. *Price* in plain binding, 63 cents; in gilt $1. We will put 8 (*plain*) copies for $3, cash.

WHAT IS IN THE WIND?

There have been many attempts made, first and last, among the professed believers in the second advent of Christ, to strangle or drive out from among them the doctrine of "*Life only through Christ*." Various have been the expedients adopted to this end; but as a large and influential part of those believers have embraced that view, it has been a hard and difficult matter to make much headway in the operation; for the truth has triumphed in spite of all such efforts. We see, however, by *The World's Crisis*, that a new scheme has lately been contrived to crush out the hated doctrine; and if we rightly judge the *Editor* of that paper is likely to be drawn into it.

A "*Convention*" has lately been held at Providence, R. I., at which the following resolution, with a preamble, "was adopted with great unanimity of feeling," saith the Editor of the *Crisis*:—

Resolved, That as co-laborers in the promulgation of the doctrines intimately connected with the near coming of Christ, they hereafter avoid preaching on the subjects relating to the state of the dead, and final destiny of the wicked, in a manner calculated to give offence to those holding opposing sentiments; and that they as far as is practicable, express themselves in the language of Scripture.

This resolution, at first view, may seem very harmless, and exceeding reasonable; but on a close examination it is easy to see that it is a covered attempt to silence the preaching of the great doctrine of life and immortality only through Christ

1. The expression, "they *hereafter* avoid preaching," &c., implies that some *heretofore* have preached on the topics spoken of so as to "give offence to those holding opposite sentiments."

2. This "manner" of "preaching on the subjects" is to be discontinued "hereafter."

3. They are henceforth, "as far as is practicable," to "express themselves in the language of Scripture."

4. This is to be done so as not "to give offence to those holding opposite sentiments."

We would like to have all who voted for this *Resolution* just step back into the Churches from which they have separated on account of the advent doctrine. We venture not one of them need fear but that they will be received with open arms; only promise "hereafter" to "avoid preaching on the subject" of Christ's second advent "in a manner calculated to give offence to those holding opposing sentiments" &c., and no doubt you will quickly be at peace with all the Churches from which you have separated. On such terms Luther might have remained in the Church of Rome.

But it is only to avoid preaching "in a manner *calculated* to give offence," &c. If those who have opposed the doctrine of Life only through Christ have preached in that manner let them cease, if they feel called to it. We know that truth, which is opposed to long established traditions, must and will give offence; and we might as well pledge ourselves not to preach such truth at all as to resolve we will "avoid preaching" it "in a manner calculated to give offence."

If all that was meant to be inculcated was, that those holding opposite views should treat each other *courteously*, then say so, and let it be given as advice, or recommendation: but these *resolutions*, in public bodies, amount to *laws*, though without specified penalties. If violated by those who agree to them, surely, they are guilty of something, for which the same body, reassembled, should call them to account. Then who is to determine what the nature of the offence is? and what the penalty to be inflicted? Here we have the stepping stones to an inquisitorial supervision of all our preaching, if we consent to such a resolution as the one under consideration. A more open and frank course would be to adopt a *Creed*, at once, and define what we must or must not preach. How can a believer in life only through Christ tell when he is preaching in a manner to give offence? He may use, if you please, Scripture, and that almost exclusively, and he cannot be sure that he does not give offence. Let him say "the dead know not anything"—"there is no knowledge in sheol whither thou goest"—"in that very day his thoughts perish," &c., can he know that it will not give offence to an opposing brother, who thinks the dead "know more than all the world" of the living? Ah, but that is "Scripture language." Very well: what more is the expression, "The dead are unconscious?" Is this last to give offence, and the other not? Where is the line, and who is to decide?

If the advocates of natural immortality and the endless misery of the wicked have found out they cannot meet our arguments, and now wish to bargain with us not to annoy them, let them honestly acknowledge they have no valid arguments in support of their theory, and not ask us to stop in our course of uprooting their traditions about souls never to die, and eternal misery; and not seek to entrap us with a resolution which they would justly spurn if proposed on the subject of the advent, or personal appearing of Christ, the second time, by the churches they have left because they believed those churches opposed the truth. We

have no idea of putting our neck under a new sect, to ask them what we shall preach or how we shall preach. We require no one else to consult us in this matter, and we will not submit to a resolution, even, which implies that they have any right to be "offended" at our "manner" of preaching what we believe. If our manner is unchristian, rebuke us; and if we do not repent, withhold fellowship from us, and leave us to our own Master.

If Br. GRANT, editor of the *Crisis*, is prepared to be bound hand and foot, in the manner that resolution will bind him, he certainly has liberty to be so: but we trust the believers in "life only through Christ," who read his paper, will not generally sell their birth-right for a mess of pottage. We have bought our right to speak plainly and fearlessly, on all truths, too dearly to sacrifice it to the demands of our opponents, just at a time, too, when they have found they cannot meet us in a fair and open field.

The leading portion of those whose names appear at the Providence Convention are those who have opposed us in the most unscrupulous "manner." If they wish to alter *their* "manner" let them do it. When we feel called to alter ours we shall do so: not by a Convention "resolution," but in a surer way. We know not what Br. Grant's "manner" has been heretofore, but from our little knowledge of him, we should think he had always been exceeding mild and kind. If so, he ought to have considered that he had just cause of "offence" with those who asked him to vote for the resolution we have commented on.—Was not his past course a sufficient pledge that "*hereafter*" he would "avoid preaching on the subjects" referred to, "in a manner calculated to give offence?" Has he ever done the thing *heretofore* that he now *resolves* he will not do hereafter?

The fact is, this resolution is a covered attempt to silence the advocates of "life only through Christ," by reducing them to mere quotations of Scripture. This indeed would be all-sufficient if the public generally would let words have their proper and legitimate weight; but most professors of religion have so long been accustomed to put "darkness for light, and light for darkness," that they are ready to affirm death is life; and that when God saith, "The soul that sinneth it shall *die*," He means not what the words clearly import, but that the soul that sinneth shall be kept alive in eternal torments. And when it is said, "The gift of God is eternal *life* through Jesus Christ our Lord," it is not *life* that is intended, but *happiness!* This perversion of God's truth must be exposed and refuted; and if any of our brethren can do it "in a manner" to give no "offence" to those who have lived under the traditions of sectarians, and the drilling in the doctrine of "an immortal soul that can never die," then let them do it: but we have no faith or hope that such traditions will give way without some being dreadfully "offended."

Our Saviour preached a sermon on life only through himself which gave offence to many of his disciples even. They said, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it:" Jesus said, "Doth this *offend* you?" and immediately gave them to understand they would soon have harder things to dispose of. This gave them further offence, it seems, for "From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him." See John 6: 47—66.

Suppose he had had the wise counsellors assembled at the late Providence Convention, and they had persuaded him to let them draw up a resolution; how would it run? Peter, James, and Judas, perhaps, from the Committee to draft a *preamble* and resolution. They report as follows:—

"*Whereas*, unity of labor, and as far as may be, unity of faith are necessary to the successful prosecution of the work of God; and as there is a diversity of sentiment among us as a people, producing to some extent dissimilar interests; and as we believe, that a candid and Christian interchange of views would remove in a great measure the conflicting interests, if not harmonize the discordant views: therefore—

"*Resolved*, That as co-laborers in the promulgation of the doctrines intimately connected with the [Messiahship] of Christ, they hereafter avoid preaching on the subjects relating to the state of the dead, and final destiny of the wicked in a manner calculated to give offence to those holding opposing sentiments: and they as far as is practicable, express themselves in the language of Scripture."

In the foregoing preamble and resolution, we have the exact words of the Providence Convention, with the exception of the word in brackets, which is substituted for the words "near coming." Does such a "Report of the Committee" seem strange after Jesus had so preached as to "offend many of his disciples?" Only think! nearly all were about to "go away!" Must not something be done to soothe their feelings? And if the Providence Convention resolution is only "adopted with great unanimity of feeling" how smooth everything will go!

There was an informal resolution passed by the "twelve," after Jesus turned to them and said—"Will ye *also* go away?". "Peter," as spokesman for the twelve, "answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of *etenal* LIFE: and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Noble confession! how unlike the Providence Convention resolution. No matter who is *offended*, or who goes away—life, *eternal life*, and that only through and by Christ, is to be the great theme: that except a man eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood he has no life in him, and is not to share in the promise—"I will raise *him* up at the last day."—Like those who fell "in the wilderness," they "*are dead*"—have "*no life in*" them. This was the doctrine that gave offence then, and gives offence to "*many*" now: and if the Editor of the *Crisis* or any one else thinks it can be preached in a manner not calculated to give offence to those who oppose it, they will find themselves as much mistaken as Paul did when he thought to escape the condemnation of the Jewish Christians, for preaching to the Gentiles against their being circumcised, and so, on the advice of some of his cautious brethren, he undertook to go through with certain Jewish purifications to appease them, but soon found himself in more trouble than if he had not sought to pacify them at all. See Acts 21: 17—40.

The Pope—His Destination.

FROM HENRY BALDWIN, JR.

Bro Storrs.—I had occasion to call on a *Jewish Rabbi*, minister of the Congregation which worship at the Synagogue in *Fulton street*, in this city;—a learned man. Being detained to dinner, I took occasion to ask him what he thought of the rumored project for the removal of the *Papacy* to *Jerusalem*; and how the *Jews* and the *Pope* would ever agree, in case the Jews should speedily be restored. "*I will tell you*"—the *Rabbi* readily replied:—"the *Pope* is *not going* to *Jerusalem*, —he is GOING to *America*."——"Ah!" observed I; "and then this pretended project of a *removal* to *Jerusalem*, is only a *cloak* to conceal their real designs?" "*That is it*," said the *Rabbi*. Considering all the evidence before us, respecting the design upon the Valley of the Mississippi—this supposition of the Rabbi looks not unreasonable.

Albany, N. Y.

REMARKS BY EDITOR.—We suspect none of us can tell very definitely where the Pope will go, till the event reveals it. We think, however, the *Papacy* will go to "perdition" quite as soon as to America; but time will show.

From Eld. Edwin Burnham.

Brother Storrs.—Your paper—the BIBLE EXAMINER—was put into my hand, by a friend, this morning; and after looking it over I felt a desire to address you a line, and commend your course of free investigation of all Bible doctrine. That is the only way, I think, to arrive at truthful conclusions. I admire the neatness and elegance of your little sheet, and hope you may prosper in all the right. If my scribblings will be of any use to you I shall be glad, occasionally, to write a few lines, and help you. May the blessing of God be upon you. EDWIN BURNHAM.

Newburyport, Mass., November, 1856.

The following is the first offering Br. BURNHAM has ever made to our paper.—ED. EX.

The Resurrection of the Dead.

It is a most happy circumstance for us that the Scriptures are so full and explicit in relation to this blessed doctrine. The resurrection of the dead! What a world of awful and glorious meaning in that expression! What solemn, tender, and moving associations of thought come crowding into the mind when the words are read or heard!—Fathers, mothers, wives, husbands, children, brothers, sisters, friends, and loved ones are sleeping in the dark, damp, silent, noisome grave, and we hear their welcome voices, and look upon their lovely forms no more, while days, and months, and years roll on. Shall it be so forever? No; blessed be the omnipotent God! They shall live again. The mighty God hath spoken, and He will make His promise good. He who formed our bodies at the first—who gathered the particles of our wonderful and curious frame—who arranged our muscles, bones, sinews, and nerves, when as yet there were none of them—He shall be able, when we and ours have decomposed in the tomb, and wasted away in the dust of the earth, to call bone again to his fellow bone, and dust to kindred dust. Let the sceptic mock, and utter his jests, and enquire how the Almighty can bring back again our parts and parcels, when they shall have assimilated with different minerals, vegetables, and animals! nevertheless it shall be done. What if these wise ones, when God was about to make this solar system, had been within hearing of the council of heaven, and had heard it said, Let us make an orb, and call it earth, 8,000 miles in diameter and 25,000 miles in circumference, and a sun, to heat and enlighten it, a million times larger than that, and various other orbs of immense magnitude, and make all this body of matter out of nothing; what would they then have said or thought? Would they not, with their present disposition, have sneered in the face of God and angels?

Would they not, with more assurance than now they speak in relation to the resurrection, have at once exclaimed, Impossible! But, "He spake

and it was done: He commanded and it stood fast." And shall He find it hard to *gather* who at first *created* from non-existence? Let us rejoice that we depend not on human power, or even angelic might to accomplish our hope. We wait on Him and for Him who holds the winds in His fists, and the waters in the hollow of His hand"—who "sitteth on the circle of the earth," and turns the seasons in their courses—who guides the fury of the storm with His will, shakes the blazing lightnings from His fingers, scatters abroad the echoes of the bellowing thunders, rolls the jarring earthquake at our feet, and controls the floods and flames—who weighs the hills and mountains in His balances, and to whom the inhabitants of the earth are like the small dust of the balance.—This all powerful God is ours! He shall speak again, and the silence of the tomb shall echo to His voice, and the prisoners of darkness shall show themselves. He shall speak, and the heavens and the earth shall quake, and from earth and ocean His chosen ones shall come to the brightness of immortality. Hail, hour of God! Hail, crowning event all-glorious! We that have "the first fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves" for the joyful introduction of that glad day. O come redemption final!

EDWIN BURNHAM.

THE RIGHT SPIRIT.—The following letter, from sister WOOD, of *Millport*, Pa., manifests the right spirit; but we apprehend some who have been our subscribers will not imitate it. They have thought themselves cured of sectarianism, but this last test, in the EXAMINER, has been too severe for them, and so they will silently give us leave to discontinue the paper. We are sorry to part with them, but they must act according to their own convictions of duty. So we claim the right to act, and we cannot complain of others for doing the same. One brother, however, we are informed, thinks there ought to be another paper started and sustained by those opposed to the views of the EXAMINER on "*Life from the Dead;*" and he has hinted that he would like to *edit* the new paper. If there were any ground to complain that we have refused brethren a place in our paper, who differed from us, or that we have not treated them courteously when we inserted their articles, then there would be cause to wish for another paper in opposition, if we refused them justice in the case. Till that is the case, an opposition paper, started for the purpose above named, would be the clearest evidence possible that its origin is in a sectarian and selfish spirit. But we intend, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, not to "fret" at any course our opposers may pursue, assured that a good conscience is more to be prized than to be an *Editor*. If the BIBLE EXAMINER has performed its mission, and is no longer needed in the field, no one will rejoice more than we at its discontinuance. If any think it is a desirable position we have had to occupy, they just know nothing about it. To be thrown out, alone, beyond the sympathies of a large portion of the Christian world—to be regarded either with suspicion or contempt, by those who we trust love the Lord, because we have followed our own convictions of what truth is—to be blamed and forsaken by those who have professed to be profited greatly by the truths, for which we have sacrificed all we had of earth's goods to promulgate—to live a life of continual crucifixion for what we believe to be truth, is not a life to be coveted: and if we could have done it with a good conscience we would have given over the struggle, long ago, and sunk into the quiet of some comfortable church, where we could have rested from this continual tossing of tempestuous winds.

We now say, once for all, if our receipts for the EXAMINER, early in January, do not warrant an honest expectation, that we can meet the cost of paper and printing, we shall not issue it longer, but will return whatever money has been sent us by subscribers, and bid them all "*farewell*" till a more favorable time shall arrive to renew the conflict. Having said thus much, we now give the letter which led us into this train of remarks. It is as follows:—

Br. Storrs.—Seeing the time has nearly arrived that we should renew our subscription, I write to let you know we intend to do so. We are not of that number who say "farewell" to the EXAMINER or its *Editor*, although we differ with you in regard to the question, Will the wicked dead be made alive? I believe they will—you believe they will not. You may be right. I dare not say, I know I am right and you are wrong; but my impression is, they must be resurrected to life in order to suffer the second death. We are informed that at Christ's *coming* every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him. Now I cannot see how they that pierced him can see him unless they are made alive. But if I am in an error my prayer to God is, I may see it, and I will most certainly renounce it. My motto is, *truth*. We have taken the BIBLE EXAMINER for the last two years, and shall continue to take it unless something more than mere differences of opinion intervenes between us and its Editor. For me to say Brother STORRS must believe just as I do, or I will not take his paper, is, to my mind, the same as to say, you must believe *our creed* or you must leave our church. I hope our brothers and sisters who are of like precious faith with us, and especially those who have been creed-bound, will look well to this, remembering we should not lord it over God's heritage, but grant every one the right

of conscience. I have
cure new subscribers. C
is so many isms here th
to know anything outsi
less there are some in tl
to stand up for the tru
you and I, dear Brothe
our Saviour at his co
sincere prayer of the o
lines.

From Rev

Dear Brother Storrs
the EXAMINER. I wis
make it twenty. Is it
devoted to matters of s
poorly supported? Bu
will have its numerou
little cared for.

I have conversed
members. They have
of the argument; but
interest enough in the
strive to learn whethe

Will you permit me
myself? I am nearly
of 24, from being a ve
I became interested in
what has ever seemed
able manner, was, I tr
I united with the Calv
26 years old I was ord
church. Have been s
this, my native town,
About six years ago
with neuralgia—suffe
and limbs. Have nea
fined to the house; ar
formed any ministeria
has generally been cle
the time.

I happened to meet
mons, which called n
and have become enti
that "the wages of s
of God Eternal Life
Lord." And when I
distinctly (as I do) h
use the word) with th
I am astonished, that
ed) are not more int
Association, I withdre
ation, and am no lo
have never been exclu

of conscience. I have done what I could to procure new subscribers. One Brother has said, there is so many isms here that the people do not care to know anything outside their creeds: nevertheless there are some in this vicinity who are willing to stand up for the truth at all hazards. That you and I, dear Brother, may be ready to meet our Saviour at his coming and kingdom, is the sincere prayer of the one who has penned these lines.

CARSINIA WOOD.

From Rev. Abiel Wood.

WISCASSET, Dec., 1856.

Dear Brother Storrs.—I enclose two dollars for the EXAMINER. I wish it were in my power to make it twenty. Is it not surprising that a paper devoted to matters of so deep interest should be so poorly supported? But so it ever has been. Error will have its numerous adherents, while truth is little cared for.

I have conversed with ministers, and church members. They have seemed to admit the force of the argument; but, strange to say, have not interest enough in the matter to investigate and strive to learn whether "These things are so!"

Will you permit me to say a few words about myself? I am nearly fifty years old. At the age of 24, from being a very worldly and wild youth, I became interested in religious matters; and, in what has ever seemed to me to be a very remarkable manner, was, I trust, converted. Soon after I united with the Calvinist Baptist church. When 26 years old I was ordained as a minister of that church. Have been settled in only two places: *this*, my native town, and Alna, ten miles distant. About six years ago, I was violently attacked with neuralgia—suffered intense pain in my head and limbs. Have nearly all that time been confined to the house; and of course have not performed any ministerial duty. My head, however, has generally been clear, and I have read most of the time.

I happened to meet a volume of your Six Sermons, which called my attention to the subject, and have become entirely settled as to the fact, that "the wages of sin is death," and "the gift of God Eternal Life through Jesus Christ our Lord." And when I understand more and more distinctly (as I do) how this concords (if I may use the word) with the plain, simple word of God, I am astonished, that the christian world (so called) are not more interested in it. At the last Association, I withdrew from the Baptist Association, and am no longer a member, although I have never been excluded from that church. My pecuniary means are quite limited, hence my inability to do all I should like to for the good cause.

May the Lord strengthen, guide and keep you.

Yours truly,

ABIEL WOOD.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—We thank Br. Wood for the foregoing information. Though he has taken the EXAMINER the year past, and we knew he was a Minister of the Gospel, we were entirely ignorant of his history and Church relation. We sincerely hope it may please the Head of the Church to restore his health and make him a burning and shining light in this dark age.

Effects of the Doctrine.

What doctrine? That of teaching that people go to heaven at death. The following article first appeared in the *New York Evangelist*, and since that in the *Christian Advocate*. As it has passed through two such sound orthodox sheets, we shall not be accused of fabricating it. It shows how difficult it is to teach an unsophisticated mind error.

Knocking at the Door.

A TRUE STORY.

The glowing sun of a midsummer afternoon poured through the curtainless windows of a little village school, and small curly heads drooped like delicate flowers in the languid air. Among them all, little Katie's sunny ringlets fell the lowest; and if you had lifted the golden vail, you would have seen that the weary eyes had forgotten to con the line of long, hard words in the worn spelling-book, and that the silken fringes of the drooping lids were pillowed lovingly upon the sweetest little cheeks in the world. Yes, in the heated air, soothed by the lazy drone of the hungry flies, and by the restless hum of young student voices, Katie had fallen asleep.

She was dreaming, too. She was dreaming of a little brother, darling Charley, who, in the bright spring-time, when the violets were just opening their sweet blue eyes after their long sleep, had strayed away from earth, and passed through those gates of glory always open for the entering of little feet. And she dreamed that she clasped him to her lonely heart, and begged him never to leave her again. And amid the greatness of her joy she sobbed aloud, and started to find Belle's soft arm around her, and to hear her whisper, "What is the matter, darling?"

Before poor Katie could well collect her thoughts to answer, the school was dismissed, and she heard the teacher exclaim, "Hurry home, children, or you will be caught in the shower."

But Katie could not hurry, and as she walked slowly out of the door, again little Belle's sweet voice cried, "Poor Katie, are you sick?"

Then Katie poured into the sympathizing ear of her little friend all her troubles, and finished by saying, "I could not bear to find it only a dream;

I feel as if I must see Charley once more."

"Where do you think he is?" asked Belle.

"In heaven, I know," replied Katie; "and mother says he cannot come back to us, but we can go to him some time;" and her sobs broke out afresh.

"Why don't you go to him now?" cried Belle.

"I don't know the way," said Katie. "I was very sick when they took him away in the little coffin, and I don't know where they went."

"Are you sure they went to heaven?" said Belle, eagerly.

"O, I know it," said Katie.

"Then," said impulsive little Belle, "then I can show you the way. I saw where they put your little brother." The glad light in Katie's tearful eyes was beautiful to behold.

"Will you, will you show me, Belle, now, this very afternoon?"

"Yes, indeed," cried Belle; and with clasped hands, unmindful of the gathering gloom, these little pilgrims set forth on their journey to heaven.

Once on the way, a doubt oppressed Belle. "Are you sure, Katie, that you can get in?"

"Ah," said Katie, with sweet assurance, "how Charley will run to open the door!" and her cheek flushed with anticipation.

"Do you suppose Charley is *very* happy?" urged Belle.

"Very," said Katie, emphatically.

"And what does he do all the time?"

"Plays with the angels with such lovely wings," cried Katie, with great animation. "And they pick up stars, that lie all over the floor of heaven, and play with them. And the rainbows, I suppose they keep them all the summer; and how Charley used to love rainbows! He cried once because—"

"Dear me," said Belle, interrupting her in great dismay, "it rains, and we are so far from home; what shall we do?"

"But we are almost to heaven, arn't we? Let us hurry, and go in there."

"Yes," said Belle; "I see the door."

"Where? where?" cried Katie breathlessly.

"There," responded little Belle, pointing to the rising ground and iron door of the village vault.

"O," exclaimed Katie, with intense disappointment, "is that heaven? O, Belle, it is like a great grave;" and her little lip quivered sadly.

"Why," said Belle, "that is where they took your brother, the very place; and you said he had gone to heaven. Besides, continued she, brightening, "when we get through the little dark door, it may be all very bright and beautiful on the other side."

"Perhaps it is," said Katie, more hopefully.

But now the large drops began to fall very fast, and a thunder storm, in all its sublimity, burst upon the little travelers. The burdened west gleamed like an ocean of flame, and the floor of heaven resounded to the solemn tread of the mighty thunder. Still the little children, with clasped hands and pale lips, pressed on, and their angels who "do always behold the face of our Father," watched over them lovingly, and they walked secure in the heavenly company.

At last the busy, pattering feet, reached the gloomy entrance, and Katie's sweet, hopeful lips were pressed close to the cold door.

"Knock," cried Belle; and with all her strength Katie did knock, and a hollow echo was all her reply, while the dead within heeded not the call from fresh, young, hopeful lips, and the little brother, with folded eyes, and pale clasped hands, heard not the sweet, imploring cry.

"Charley, dear Charley, it is your sister; your own sister Katie; won't you open the door?"

"He does not hear you, Katie, it thunders so," said Belle. "Let us wait a little while;" and they waited.

Soon there was a lull in the storm, and again Katie, strong in faith, knocked at the dreary door, and her loving cry: "Charley, dear Charley," echoed sadly back.

"Do you hear anything?" asked Belle, with parted lips; "is he coming?"

"No," replied Katie, "I thought once I heard his little feet, but it was only the rain."

"Perhaps," suggested Belle, with large imaginative eyes, "perhaps he is playing with the angels a great way off, in a beautiful garden."

"O," sobbed Katie, "I hope he will not love the little angels more than me!"

"Knock once more, just once," whispered Belle. With wavering faith again the little, soft hand pleaded for entrance, and a tremulous voice cried piteously: "Charley, darling, dear, sweet little brother, please open the door to your own poor Katie. Do not love the little angels better than me. O, Charley, Charley!" She threw herself upon the ground, and sobbed in an agony of grief and disappointment.

"Katie," said Belle, half frightened at this outburst, "let us go home now, and come again tomorrow and try."

"No," said Katie, with touching hopelessness, "I shall never come again. Let us go."

She rose without another sob, or fresh tear, even upon the wet cheek; but the grieved expression of the sweet, childish mouth was pitiful to behold.

"Back over all the dreary way went Katie and Belle. Little shoes wet, little dresses dripping, little heads bent like dew-laden flowers, little hearts very heavy.

At Katie's door stood her anxious mother, peering through the shadow for her darling.

The child sprang to those loving arms, and with one cry that spoke all the agony of bitter doubt that had crept into her young, confiding heart, exclaimed: "O, mother, I have been knocking at the door of heaven, and Charley would not let me in."

Dear, grieved little Katie, refusing to be comforted in this thy first great sorrow. It may be that ere the violets come again, "God's hand will beckon unawares," and with a better guide thou shalt find indeed the door of heaven. Then knock, little pilgrim, and thou shalt be heard amid the hallelujahs of all the heavenly choirs. Back shall roll the blessed portals, and Charley shall lead thee with eager wings to the feet of Him who loves little children, while the song of angels shall be, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven."

From M. C. Aller

Br. Storrs.—As others the Lord from Heaven," Jesus," to subdue all thi up His spiritual kingdom, from the earth, it has be light to me to study the prayerfully, that I migh holy prophets have spok began, respecting the gl things. Having Scott's them up recently, to re ascertain what he has sai esting subject. His vie school, favor a spiritual r to be accomplished by passages, where the tru none other, than, (accord rect exegesis) the literal the Son of man, he viola views. He leaves the re defined making all to con ed opinion; and passes the second advent, or wholly figurative. But ful, to the devout, humbl advance *one sentiment* in is to see such perversion false construction on the lation.

It is with astonishme such contradictory const ded, in "these last days, While the punishment o by the prophets, to be d plainly proclaimed, Sco eternal *suffering* and *to* not a syllable is spoke stance—on a plain text is Isaiah 66: 24. He events may be alluded t and the fire represent th punishment of sinners in which is kindled by the be quenched or cease worm of keen self-reflect accusing conscience, will the existence and consci will be everlasting."

In confirmation of t Bishop Lowth, who says ed the place of torment na; and the punishme worm which there preye fire which consumed the ing, however, in the str ence between Gehenna, torment, namely, that in is transient; the worm body, dies; and the fire is soon extinguished: Gehenna the instrument everlasting, and the suff

Let me ask candidly, ence pointed out in Scri and where is the place o does our Saviour say the

From M. C. Allen, Black Rock.

Br. Storrs.—As others who are "looking for the Lord from Heaven," and "the man Christ Jesus," to subdue all things unto himself, to set up His spiritual kingdom, and to remove the curse from the earth, it has been a great source of delight to me to study the prophets. I have read prayerfully, that I might understand what the holy prophets have spoken, ever since the world began, respecting the glorious restitution of all things. Having Scott's commentaries, I took them up recently, to read them once more, and ascertain what he has said, relating to that interesting subject. His views like all of the same school, favor a spiritual reign of holiness on earth, to be accomplished by man's agency. All the passages, where the true interpretation can be none other, than, (according to the rules of correct exegesis) the literal and personal coming of the Son of man, he violates by his own beclouded views. He leaves the real sense, vague and undefined making all to comport with his preconceived opinion; and passes over paragraphs proving the second advent, or tries to explain them as wholly figurative. But what is vastly more painful, to the devout, humble christian, who dares not advance *one sentiment* in addition to the "word," is to see such perversions and ingenuity to put a false construction on the plain statements of revelation.

It is with astonishment and humility we find such contradictory constructions, and so much added, in "these last days," to God's eternal truth. While the punishment of the wicked is reiterated by the prophets, to be death, destruction, and that plainly proclaimed, Scott adds his comments of eternal *suffering* and *torture*, in a world of which, not a syllable is spoken in the Bible. One instance—on a plain text which interprets itself—is Isaiah 66: 24. He says, "Whatever eternal events may be alluded to or predicted, the worm and the fire represent the place and nature, of the punishment of sinners in *another* world. The fire, which is kindled by the wrath of God, shall not be quenched or cease to torment for ever: the worm of keen self-reflection and the anguish of an accusing conscience, will endure for ever; because the existence and consciousness of the condemned will be everlasting."

In confirmation of these sentiments, he quotes Bishop Lowth, who says—"Our Saviour expressed the place of torment under the image of Gehenna; and the punishment of the wicked, by the worm which there preyed on the carcasses and the fire which consumed the wretched victims. Marking, however, in the strongest manner the difference between Gehenna, and the invisible place of torment, namely, that in the former the suffering is transient; the worm itself, that preys on the body, dies; and the fire which totally consumes it, is soon extinguished: whereas, in the figurative Gehenna the instruments of punishment shall be everlasting, and the sufferings without end."

Let me ask candidly, where is the marked difference pointed out in Scripture of which he speaks and where is the place of endless torment? where does our Saviour say the suffering shall be without end? Are not the above quotations, adding to God's words?

H. Grew to R. Wendell.

Dear Br. Wendell.—You are pleased to set "Bro. Grew of 1852" againt "Bro. Grew of 1856.' For proof of discrepancy, you make two quotations from "Bro. Grew of 1852," *viz*—"The wages of sin is DEATH," and "Life in a miserable state, is *no more* DEATH than life in a happy state." It remains for you to show what "Bro. Grew of 1856" believes inconsistent with either of these quotations. I deny any and all inconsistency.

My two propositions which you have quoted, are no more incompatible with my belief of the conscious suffering of the wicked as a judicial punishment, between their "resurrection to condemnation," John 5: 29, and their "second death," Rev. 20: 14, "according to the deeds done in the body," than they are incompatible with my brother's belief of their sufferings, as a judicial punishment, antecedent to their first death.

Yours for the truth,
HENRY GREW.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We have only room in this number, for the above note from Br. GREW. If we continue to publish, his other communication shall have attention. We think Br. Grew labors under a mistake in regard to Br. Wendell's believing in "a judicial punishment, antecedent" to death. But he must answer for himself, if he has opportunity.

From E. T. Welch and E. Wolcott.

OCEANPORT, N. J. Dec. 4th, 1856.

Dear Br. Storrs.—We wish you to send to the following persons the last number of this year.—[The names of about thirty are given.—ED.]

As we know you cannot afford to scatter the EXAMINER any longer, having done so heretofore to the extent of your means, and more, until thousands of the people of the United States have been made glad by the blessed doctrine of "Life and Immortality through our Lord Jesus Christ *alone*;" and as we have been made to rejoice greatly on account of this truth, we feel that duty compels us to act our part, that others may see the truth and rejoice also, and thereby be better prepared to meet the coming King, who is very soon to be revealed to the admiration of all those who believe, in that day. The "truth" has had a sanctifying effect upon our hearts and lives. We love the dear Saviour better than we ever did.—The *knowledge* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ has, in a great measure, destroyed our barrenness and unfruitfulness. This truth and the hope of being like our Saviour when he appears, has led to much purging out the *old* man with his deeds, and the putting on the new man.

We have concluded that the plan of sending the EXAMINER, as we propose, will introduce it to circles where it has not yet been read; and if the doctrine taught therein should arrest their attention, they may subscribe for the coming year.

REMARK BY THE EDITOR.—These brethren accompanied the foregoing note with $10 and two *new* subscribers at $2 each. If all who are with us in the faith of "LIFE *only* through Christ," were as prompt, and as much in earnest as they are, we should not have lisped a note but that the EXAMINER would be fully sustained. These brethren have no large store of this world's good; and they get their bread by the labor of their hands. Many have been blessed by the truths we publish. A large number of them, however, remind us of our Lord's words, when *one*, of "ten," *only* returned, who had been healed, "to give glory to God." But we add no more.

"LIFE FROM THE DEAD: *Or, the Righteous only will Live Again.*"—Though we have not received pledges sufficient to meet the expense of the issue of this work, we have determined—in view of the *possibility* of the EXAMINER being *suspended*—to publish it immediately, and it is in the hands of the compositor. Those, therefore, who have pledged funds for this object will do us a favor to forward the amount as early as possible; and others who are disposed to help in getting out the work will please remember us *now*. Those who send funds immediately shall have the amount returned in the work at the *cost* price as soon as it is out.

The retail price will not exceed 25 cents. We shall put it at less if possible; but this will depend entirely upon the demand for it. Two or three thousand can be worked off at a less price, per copy, than one thousand. We would be glad to have it read by all believers in life *only* through Christ, whatever conclusion they might arrive at. A consecutive argument on the subject has not, before, ever been presented to our readers. What they have read has been in disjointed parts, so as to make it extremely difficult to satisfy their own minds, perfectly, either way. We do not claim that this work is perfect, yet we think it will *help* to settle the question.

INDEX FOR 1856.

An Old Heathen 8
Annihilation—Mr. Thompson 33
Assert your Right 96
A Correspondence 185
Annihilation Annihilated 187
Baptized for the Dead 78
Belief of the Ancients—Cowles 188
Bible vs. Creeds 282
Backsliding in Old Age 302
Constitution of the Ch...35, 97, 146, 180
Cultivation of Spiritual Feelings 77
Comfort, Rev. Silas 81, 265
Canticles by Steam 167
Christ Died for Us 173
Church Officers—Grew 205
Christian Race 229
Concerning Editors 236
Christian Advocate and its Editor 287
Christianity in Chinese Revolution 302
Destroyer of Anti-Christ 38
Day of Crucifixion 64
Death Not a Translation 91
Dr. Pye Smith—Ham 91
Dualism, Dr. Post—F 214
Dream of Caleb Edmonds 277
Death Bed Testimonies 279
Divine Life—Joyful Church 289
Eastern War—English Tract 41
Egyptian Light-house 112
Eccl. 9: 4-6. Exposition of 189
Expedient for Loving & Forgiving 275
European Affairs 296
English Tracts 200
Effects of the Doctrine 317
Gentleness of Christ 78
Great Business of Life 105
Grew & Macknight Jr., ...106, 156, 197, 201, 234, 255
Glorying in the Lord 166
Grim on John 5: 28, 29 203
Great Cure-all 279
Harvest of the Earth—Eng. Tract 100
How to be Rich in Heaven 109
How They Talk 133
Harmony in Family 135
Immortality—Essays 1, 18, 49
Is Death of Nature? 199
I have Lived too Fast 240
In Heaven an Hour 261
Important Questions 256
Judgment, The—Editor 4
Judge Hart, of Oswego 9
Jews in Palestine 165
Just Rebuke 267
Letters—Cook, Merwin, Ladd, 13. Sr. in Christ Wade, 14. Prof. Huber, M. C. Allen, C. Colver, 15. Ursulo Eaton, 23. W. H. Barne-, 24. Grim, 29, 109, 187. Wm. Ridgeway, 30. Eld Blain, 31, 128, 187, 286. Schenck, 31. Harris, Dye, 39. Rew, 47. Merrill, 48. Hudson, 59, C. C. Williams, 79. Lewis, 107. Cowles, 108. Dr. Huntington, 127, 216. Z Campbell, 128. P. A. Smith, B. S. Batchelor, Macknight, Jr., 151.—Lindsey, 224. Mrs. Judson, 271. Wendell, 272. Ross, 251. M. C. Allen, S. Mason, 252. Ferree, 253. Wade, 255. Private Letter, 256. Grew, 294. E. Burnham. 315. A. Wood, 317.
Living Soul—Z. Campbell 129
Lazarus in Abraham's Bosom ..142, 225
Lewiston, Me., Exclusion of Bren.. 143
Man's Origin and Nature 89
Mind and Matter 150
Man's Destiny 192
Man's Inheritance—Editor 268
Ministering Spirits 250
New York Central College 54, 68
Napoleon and Jerusalem 60
Neander's Hypothesis 243
Nature and Immortality 305
New Idea of the Pope 223, 232
Obituaries—A. Perrine, 111. Anne Potter, 215.
Prayer of Jesus on the Cross 17
Personalities—Cook 22
Proof of Immortality—Wesleyan 40
Presentiment 62
Palestine—Cook 63
Preaching and Preachers—Editor. 104
Prayer of King Henry VIII 105, 143
Personal Anti-Christ 136
Prophecy 259, 273, 291, 308
Papal Contest in France 268
Present & Future Knowledge—Ed. 283
Penalty of the Law—Grew in '52.. 294
Purifying Hope—Editor 298
Poetry—Time of Reward, 48. The Parted Spirit, 64. Bible vs. Tradition, 96. Christian Resignation, 112.—Death, 208. The Perfect Work, 224. Desiring to be Given Up to God, 297. The Memory of the Just, 311.
Questions by Dodge 40
Quiet Spirit—its Power 63
Regeneration, Final—Bull 95
Resurrection, 1 Cor. 15—Ed 152, 184
Rap him again sharply 236
Romanism in Italy 262
Resurrection—Editor 264
Religion Abroad 275
Resurrection—Burnham 315
Right Spirit 316
Spirit of Christianity—Ed 56
Scripture Exp—C. C. W 94
Spirit Rapping 95
Sadducees Partly Right—M. J 106
Say Your Prayers in Fair Weather 110
Soul Saved or Lost—Ed 113
Scott, Orange 135
Spirit 145
Saul and Woman of Endor 177, 193
Sight and Faith: or Earth & Heaven 206
Strictures on Bishop Bull 246
Shall we vote? 249
Sylogism—Editor 295
Stricture by H. Grew 300
Turned into Hell 176
True Prayer 237
Trust for Daily Bread 238
Thoughts and Ap.—Whately 238
The Covenants—Grew 257
The Pope—his destination 315
Wicked Dead—Grew and Editor—. 10
" " 24, 44, 45, 57, 72, 80, 203
" " —Hall and Editor— 26
65, 73, 118, 161, 168, 209, 216
" " —W. A. M 140
" " Opinions on the Ques. 208
" " Private Letter on 231
What Next?—Wendell 15
Williams, Mrs. C. C., to Beecher... 70
Wandering Thoughts 228, 241
Wisdom shall die with you 232
Witness of the Spirit 304
What is in the Wind?—Editor 313

ATLA

No. 327

BIBLE EXAMINER

V.3-11, 1848-1856

Photographed for:
THE AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
BOARD OF MICROTEXT PROJECT

INCOMPLETE or IMPERFECT

"THE BEST AND MOST COMPLETE COPY THAT COULD BE LOCATED WAS USED AT THE TIME OF FILMING. IF THERE IS AN IMPERFECT OR MISSING SECTION, AND IT IS SUBSEQUENTLY LOCATED, IT WILL BE FILMED AND ADDED TO THE REEL."

END

OF FILM

"PLEASE REWIND"